arXiv:1608.07153v2 [math.PR] 14 Dec 2016

GEOMETRY OF THE VACANT SET LEFT BY RANDOM WALK ON RANDOM GRAPHS, WRIGHT'S CONSTANTS, AND CRITICAL RANDOM GRAPHS WITH PRESCRIBED DEGREES

SHANKAR BHAMIDI[1] AND SANCHAYAN SEN[2]

ABSTRACT. We provide an explicit algorithm for sampling a connected uniform random graph with given degree sequence by first sampling a plane tree with a modified degree sequence according to an appropriately defined measure on the space of plane trees with this modified degree sequence. A careful analysis of this algorithm allows us to derive continuum scaling limits for uniform simple connected graphs with given degree sequence under some regularity conditions. By products of this central result include:

(a) asymptotics for the number of *connected simple graphs* with *prescribed degree* sequence and fixed complexity;
(b) scaling limits for the metric space structure of the maximal components in the critical regime of both the configuration model and the uniform simple random graph model with prescribed degree sequence under optimal assumptions on the degree sequence.

As a substantive application we consider the fractal properties of maximal components in the vacant set left by random walks (VSRW), a question that has witnessed a lot of interest in the probability community; see, e.g., [20–22, 26, 51, 52]. We answer a question raised by Černý and Teixeira [20] by obtaining the metric space scaling limit of maximal components in the VSRW on random regular graphs.

Assuming one is able to: (a) establish the existence of the critical point for emergence of a giant component for VSRW on random graphs with general prescribed degree sequence, and (b) establish regularity conditions of the degree sequence of the VSRW in the critical regime analogous to those established in [20] for random regular graphs, the results in this paper would imply **universality** for the metric space structure of maximal components in **VSRW on random graphs** with a **general given degree sequence** under appropriate moment conditions on the degree sequence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivated by applications in a wide array of fields ranging from sociology to systems biology and most closely related to this work, in probabilistic combinatorics and statistical physics, the last few years have witnessed an explosion in both network models as well as interacting particle systems on these models. In this context, the two major themes of this work are as follows:

[1]DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND OPERATIONS RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, USA
[2]DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA
E-mail addresses: bhamidi@email.unc.edu, sanchayan.sen1@gmail.com.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60C05, 05C80.

Key words and phrases. Multiplicative coalescent, vacant sets, critical random graphs, Gromov-Hausdorff distance, Gromov-weak topology, continuum random trees, graphs with prescribed degree sequence, configuration model, Brownian excursions, graph enumeration, Wright's constants.

(a) **Connectivity, percolation and critical random graphs:** A fundamental question in this general area is understanding connectivity properties of the network model, including the time and nature of emergence of the giant component. Writing $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ for the vertex set, most of these models have a parameter t (related to the edge density) and a model dependent critical time t_c such that for $t < t_c$ (subcritical regime), there exists no giant component (size of the largest component $|\mathscr{C}_1(t)| = o_P(n)$), while for $t > t_c$ (supercritical regime), the size of the largest component scales like $f(t)n$ with $f(t) > 0$ and is model dependent. Behavior in the so-called "critical regime" (i.e., when $t = t_c$) is the main content of this paper. To prime the reader let us informally describe the types of results closest in spirit to this work. We defer precise definitions of technical aspects (e.g., definitions of the limiting objects, the underlying topology etc.) to Section 3.1 and precise statements of related results to Section 4. The prototypical example of the "critical" phenomenon is the Erdős-Rényi random graph at criticality which is constructed as follows: Fix a parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and vertex set $[n]$ and let $\mathrm{ERRG}(n, \lambda)$ be the random graph obtained by placing each of the $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges independently with probability $n^{-1} + \lambda n^{-4/3}$. Maximal component sizes in $\mathrm{ERRG}(n, \lambda)$ were studied extensively in [6, 15, 37, 41, 45]. The scaling limit of the maximal components of $\mathrm{ERRG}(n, \lambda)$ when viewed as metric spaces was identified in [3]. It is believed that a large class of random discrete structures, in the critical regime, belong to the "Erdős-Rényi universality class." Soon after the work [3], an abstract universality principle was developed in [12, 14] which was used to establish Erdős-Rényi type scaling limits for a wide array of critical random graph models including the configuration model and various models of inhomogeneous random graphs. It is strongly believed that the components of critical percolation on high-dimensional tori [30, 31, 34], and the hypercube [33] also share the Erdős-Rényi scaling limit, but these problems are open at this point.

(b) **Vacant set left by random walk on graphs:** The second main theme is the area of random interlacements and percolative properties of the vacant set of random walks on finite graphs, see e.g. [51]. See [22] for a recent survey most closely related to this paper, and [26] for an introduction to random interlacements. This question was initially posed by Hilhorst who wanted to understand the geometry of crystals affected by corrosion. The precise mathematical model is as follows: consider a finite graph on $[n]$ vertices (and to fix ideas assumed connected) which represents the crystalline structure of the object of interest. Now suppose a "corrosive particle" wanders through the structure via a simple random walk $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ (started from say a uniformly chosen vertex), marking each vertex it visits as "corroded" (this marking does not affect the dynamics of the walk). For a fixed parameter $u \geq 0$, define the vacant set as the set of all vertices that have not been "corroded" (i.e., not visited by the walk) by time un,

$$\mathscr{V}^u = [n] \setminus \{X_t : 0 \leq t \leq nu\}. \tag{1.1}$$

When u is "small" one expects that only a small fraction of the vertices have been visited by the corrosive particle and thus the maximal connected component $\mathscr{C}_1(u)$ of the non-corroded set $\mathscr{V}^u$ has a large connected component of size $\mathscr{C}_1(u) = \Theta_P(n)$, while if u increases beyond a "critical point" $u_\star$ then the corrosion in the crystal has spread far enough that the maximal connected component in $\mathscr{C}_1(u) = o_P(n)$. The "critical" $u = u_\star$ regime and in particular the fractal properties of connected components in this regime are of great interest.

1.1. **Organization of the paper.** In the remaining subsections of the introduction, we describe the random graph models considered in this paper and give an informal description of our results. Section 2 contains precise statements of our main results. We have deferred major definitions to Section 3. We discuss the relevance of this work and connections to existing results in Section 4. In Section 5 we define some constructs used in the proof. We start Section 6 with the statement of Lemma 6.3 that contains the main technical estimates related to the uniform measure on plane trees with a prescribed children sequence. This lemma forms the crucial work horse in the rest of the proofs. The proof of this lemma occupies the rest of Section 6. Section 7 and Section 8 contain the proofs of our main results.

1.2. **Random graph models.** Fix a collection of n vertices labeled by $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and an associated degree sequence $\mathbf{d}^{(n)} = (d_v : v \in [n])$ where $\ell_n := \sum_{v\in[n]} d_v$ is assumed even. There are two natural constructions resulting in generating a random graph on the above vertex set with the prescribed degree sequence.

(a) **Uniform distributed simple graph:** Let $\mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ denote the space of all simple graphs on $[n]$-labeled vertices with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ denote the uniform distribution on this space and write $\mathcal{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ for the random graph with distribution $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$.

(b) **Configuration model** [10, 16, 44]**:** Recall that a multigraph is a graph where we allow multiple edges and self-loops. Write $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ for the space of all multigraphs on vertex set $[n]$ with prescribed degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. Write $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ for the random multigraph constructed sequentially as follows: Equip each vertex $v \in [n]$ with d_v half-edges or stubs. Pick two half-edges uniformly from the set of half-edges that have not yet been paired, and pair them to form a full edge. Repeat till all half-edges have been paired. Write $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ for the law of $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$.

1.3. **Informal description of our contribution.** This work has four major contributions which we now informally describe:

(a) We provide an explicit algorithm (Lemma 7.1) for sampling a uniform random graph with given degree sequence by first sampling a planar tree with a modified degree sequence via an appropriately defined tilt with respect to the uniform distribution on the space of trees with this modified degree sequence. This allows us to derive scaling limits for the uniform distribution on the space of simple connected graphs with degree sequence satisfying regularity conditions including a finite number of surplus edges (Theorem 2.6).

(b) We then use this result to derive scaling limits for the critical regime of both the configuration model as well as the uniform random graph model with prescribed degree sequence (Theorem 2.4). This is the strongest metric space scaling result for graphs with given degree sequence under optimal assumptions. This result improves work of [12] which was obtained as a consequence of a general universality principle but under stronger assumptions (exponential moment condition on the degree sequence). The technique used in this paper is also completely disjoint from [12].

(c) Write $C(n, n + k)$ for the number of **connected graphs** with n labeled vertices and $n + k$ edges. Deriving asymptotics for $C(n, n + k)$ for fixed k as $n \to \infty$ has inspired a large body work both in the combinatorics community [11, 50, 54] as well as in the probability community [6, 35, 53]. Extending such results to count **connected graphs** with **prescribed degree** sequence seems beyond the ken of existing techniques. As a consequence of our proof technique, we derive asymptotics for such counts (Theorem 2.7).

(d) As a substantive application, we answer a question raised by Černý and Teixeira ([20, Remark 6.1 (2)] (also see the work of Sznitman, e.g. [52, Remark 4.5]) by obtaining the metric space scaling limit of the vacant set left by random walk on random regular graphs. This is the first result about continuum scaling limit of maximal components in the critical regime for this model. The eventual hope, albeit not addressed in this paper is as follows: Consider spatial systems such as the d-dimensional lattice or perhaps more relevant to this paper, asymptotics for the vacant set left by random walks on the d-dimensional torus $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^d$ in the large $n \to \infty$ network limit. As described in [52], the basic intuition is that for high enough dimensions d, the corresponding objects should behave similar to what one sees in the context of $2d$-regular random graphs.

2. Main results

We will now describe our main results. To motivate the interested reader, we will eschew slight efficiency in the order of the statement of the results and first show the implications in the context of the main substantive application in Section 2.1. We will then come back to the general results in Section 2.2. We first fix a convention that we will follow throughout this paper.

Convention. All our metric measure spaces will be probability spaces. For any metric measure space $\boldsymbol{X} = (X, d, \mu)$ and $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \boldsymbol{X}$ will denote the metric measure space $(X, \alpha d, \mu)$, i.e, the space where the metric has been multiplied by α and the (probability) measure μ has remained unchanged. Precise definitions of metric space convergence including the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov (GHP) topology are deferred to Section 3.

2.1. Geometry of vacant sets left by random walk.

Fix $r \geq 3$ and $n \geq 1$. Here and throughout we assume nr is even. Recall the definitions of $\mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$, $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$, $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$, and $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ from Section 1.2. Let $\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)} = (r, r, \ldots, r)$, and define

$$\mathbb{G}_{n,r} := \mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{n,r} := \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{n,\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)}}.$$

Analogously write $\mathbb{P}_{n,r}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,r}$) for $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)}}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)}}$). Let $\mathcal{G}_{n,r} \sim \mathbb{P}_{n,r}$. For any (multi)graph G, write P^G for the distribution of a simple random walk $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ on G with the initial state X_0 chosen uniformly at random. Recall the definition of the vacant set from (1.1). Define,

$$u_\star = \frac{r(r-1)\ln(r-1)}{(r-2)^2} \tag{2.1}$$

Write $\mathscr{C}_1(u)$ for the maximal connected component in $\mathcal{V}^u$. Then the following was shown in [21]: With $\mathbb{P}_{n,r}$-probability converging to one as $n \to \infty$,

(a) given any $u < u_\star$ and $\sigma > 0$, there exist strictly positive constants $\rho, c > 0$ depending only on u, σ, r such that

$$P^{\mathcal{G}_{n,r}}\left(\left|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}(u)\right| \geq \rho n\right) \geq 1 - cn^{-\sigma};$$

(b) for any fixed $u > u_\star$ and $\sigma > 0$, there exists $\rho' > 0$ depending only on u, σ, r such that

$$P^{\mathcal{G}_{n,r}}\left(\left|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}(u)\right| \geq \rho' \log(n)\right) \leq cn^{-\sigma}.$$

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 display the connectivity structure of the vacant set just above and just below $u_\star$ respectively where the underlying graph is a $r = 4$-regular random graph on $n = 50,000$ vertices. The maximal component has been colored red, the second largest component blue, and all other components have been colored cyan.



FIGURE 2.1. Connectivity structure at $u = u_\star + 0.5$.



FIGURE 2.2. Connectivity structure at $u = u_\star - 0.5$.

The main aim of this section is the study of the annealed measures:

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,r}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{G}_{n,r}|} \sum_{G \in \mathbb{G}_{n,r}} P^G(\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}(\cdot) := \sum_{G \in \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{n,r}} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,r}\big(G\big) P^G(\cdot).$$

Building on the work of Cooper and Frieze [23], Černý and Teixeira in [20, Theorem 1.1] showed the following for the above annealed distribution: Let $\{u_n : n \geq 1\}$ be any sequence such that there exists fixed $\beta < \infty$ such that, $n^{1/3}|u_n - u_\star| \leq \beta$ for all large n. Then given any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists\, A := A(\varepsilon, r, \beta) > 0$ such that for all n large,

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,r}\left(A^{-1} n^{2/3} \leq |\mathscr{C}_{(1)}| \leq A n^{2/3}\right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \tag{2.2}$$

They also showed that analogous results hold for $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}(\cdot)$. The $n^{2/3}$ scaling of the maximal component size suggests that the critical behavior for this model resembles that of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph. Our first main result stated below confirms this assertion.

Theorem 2.1 (Scaling limit of the vacant set)**.** *Let $r \geq 3$.*

(i) *Let $\mathscr{G}_{n,r} \sim \mathbb{P}_{n,r}$ and $u_\star$ be as in* (2.1)*. Run a simple random walk on $\mathscr{G}_{n,r}$ up to time nu_n starting from a uniformly chosen vertex, where*

$$n^{1/3}(u_\star - u_n) \to a_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\mathscr{C}_{(j)}$ be j-th largest component of the subgraph of $\mathscr{G}_{n,r}$ induced by the vacant set $\mathcal{V}^{u_n}$. Endow $\mathscr{C}_{(j)}$ with the graph distance and the uniform probability measure on its vertices.

Then there exists a sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0) = \big(M_1^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), M_2^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), \ldots\big)$ *of random compact metric measure spaces such that under the annealed measure* $\mathbf{P}_{n,r}$,

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\big(\mathscr{C}_{(1)}, \mathscr{C}_{(2)}, \ldots\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{M}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0) = \big(M_1^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), M_2^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), \ldots\big)$$

with respect to product topology induced by GHP distance (see Section 3.2 *for definition) on each coordinate.*

(ii) *The conclusion in part (i) continues to hold with the same limiting sequence* $\boldsymbol{M}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0)$ *if we replace* $\mathscr{G}_{n,r}$ *by* $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)})$ *and* $\mathbf{P}_{n,r}$ *by the corresponding annealed measure* $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}$.

Remark 1. A complete description of the limiting spaces appearing in Theorem 2.1 requires certain definitions and is thus deferred to Section 3. The limiting object $\boldsymbol{M}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0)$ is explicitly defined in Construction 3.6. The connection between the scaling limit of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph $\mathrm{ERRG}(n, \lambda)$ and the limiting spaces in the results stated in this section is also explained in Section 3.

The above result deals with the vacant set left by random walk (VSRW) on the random r-regular graph. We in fact conjecture that for the corresponding problem on random graphs with general prescribed degree sequence, one has analogous results with a **universality** phenomenon under moment conditions on the degree sequence.

Conjecture 2.2. *Let* $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^{(n)} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ *be a degree sequence, and let* D_n *denote the degree of a vertex chosen uniformly from* $[n]$. *Assume that as* $n \to \infty$, $D_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} D$ *with* $\mathbb{E}(D^2) < \infty$ *and* $\mathbb{E}(D_n^2) \to \mathbb{E}(D^2)$. *Further assume*

$$\nu := \frac{\mathbb{E}[D(D-1)]}{\mathbb{E}[D]} > 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(D \geq 3) > 0.$$

Consider the VSRW on $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ *or* $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ *at level* u. *We conjecture that the following hold:*

(a) *There exists a (model dependent) critical point* $u_\star$ *such that for* $u < u_\star$, *size of the maximal component* $|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}(u)| = \Theta_P(n)$ *whilst for* $u > u_\star$, $|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}| = o_P(1)$.

(b) *If* $\mathbb{E}(D^3) < \infty$ *and* $\mathbb{E}(D_n^3) \to E(D^3)$, *then for* u_n *satisfying*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{1/3}(u_\star - u_n) = a_0$$

for some $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, *the connectivity structure of VSRW at level* u_n *with edges in the maximal components rescaled by* $n^{-1/3}$ *satisfy results analogous to Theorem* 2.1.

(c) *Let* $p_k := \mathbb{P}(D = k)$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots$. *Assume that there exists* $C > 0$ *and* $\tau \in (3, 4)$ *such that*

$$p_k \sim C k^{-\tau} \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

(In particular, $\mathbb{E}[D^2] < \infty$, *but* $\mathbb{E}[D^3] = \infty$.*) Then for any* $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, *there exists a sequence* $\boldsymbol{M}_\tau^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0) = \big(M_{\tau,1}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), M_{\tau,2}^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0), \ldots\big)$ *of random metric measure spaces such that under the annealed measure* $\mathbf{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ *(or* $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$*),*

$$n^{-\frac{\tau-3}{\tau-1}}\big(\mathscr{C}_{(1)}(u_n), \mathscr{C}_{(2)}(u_n), \ldots\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{M}_\tau^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0),$$

for any sequence u_n *satisfying*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}(u_\star - u_n) \to a_0.$$

Remark 2. At this point, we owe the reader two clarifications regarding the conjecture. First we need to clarify the phrase "results analogous to Theorem 2.1" in (b). Second we need to give some details on the limit objects $\boldsymbol{M}_\tau^{\mathrm{vac}}(a_0)$ in (c). Both of these clarifications are deferred to the discussion Section 4 (c).

2.2. **Scaling limits of random graphs with prescribed degrees.** This section describes our main results on graphs with prescribed degree sequence. The first result describes maximal component structure for critical random graphs under appropriate assumptions. For each $n \geq 1$ let $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^{(n)} = (d_v : v \in [n])$ be a degree sequence with vertex set $[n]$. We will work with degree sequences that satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 2.3. *Let D_n be a random variable with distribution given by*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(D_n = i\big) = \frac{1}{n}\#\big\{j \,:\, d_j = i\big\},$$

i.e., D_n has the law of the degree of a vertex selected uniformly at random from $[n]$. Assume the following hold as $n \to \infty$:

(i) *There exists a limiting random variable D with $\mathbb{P}(D = 1) > 0$ such that $D_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} D$.*

(ii) *Convergence of third moments (and hence all lower moments):*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[D_n^3\big] := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in[n]} d_v^3 \to \mathbb{E}\big[D^3\big] < \infty.$$

(iii) *We are in the critical scaling window, i.e., there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\nu_n := \frac{\sum_{v\in[n]} d_v(d_v-1)}{\sum_{v\in[n]} d_v} = 1 + \frac{\lambda}{n^{1/3}} + o(n^{-1/3}).$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}[D^2] = 2\,\mathbb{E}[D]$.

Recall that $\mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ denotes the space of all simple graphs on n vertices with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$.

Theorem 2.4 (Scaling limit of graphs with given degree sequence under optimal assumptions)**.** *Suppose $\{\mathbf{d}^{(n)} : n \geq 1\}$ satisfy Assumption* 2.3 *with limiting random variable D.*

(i) *Let $\mathscr{C}_{(j)}$ be the j-th largest component of $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$. Endow $\mathscr{C}_{(j)}$ with the graph distance and the uniform probability measure on its vertices. Then there exists a sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda) = (M_1^D(\lambda), M_2^D(\lambda), \ldots)$ of (random) compact metric measure spaces such that*

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\big(\mathscr{C}_{(1)}, \mathscr{C}_{(2)}, \ldots\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda)$$

with respect to product topology induced by GHP distance on each coordinate.

(ii) *The conclusion of part (i) continues to hold with the same limiting sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda)$ if we replace $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ by $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$.*

Remark 3. The limit objects $\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda)$ are described explicitly in Construction 3.5.

The main ingredient in proving the above result is the following result about the uniform distribution on the space of all **connected** simple graphs with a prescribed degree sequence. For each fixed $\widetilde{m} \geq 1$, let $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})} = (\widetilde{d}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{d}_{\widetilde{m}})$ be a given degree sequence. Consider the following assumption on $\{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})} : \widetilde{m} \geq 1\}$:

Assumption 2.5.

(i) $\widetilde{d}_j \geq 1$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq \widetilde{m}$, *and* $\widetilde{d}_1 = 1$.
(ii) *There exists a pmf* $(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \ldots)$ *with*

$$\tilde{p}_1 > 0, \quad \sum_{i\geq 1} i\,\tilde{p}_i = 2, \quad \text{and } \sum_{i\geq 1} i^2\,\tilde{p}_i < \infty$$

such that

$$\frac{1}{\widetilde{m}} \#\{j : \widetilde{d}_j = i\} \to \tilde{p}_i \ \text{ for } \ i \geq 1, \ \text{ and } \ \frac{1}{\widetilde{m}} \sum_{i\geq 1} \widetilde{d}_i^2 \to \sum_{i\geq 1} i^2\,\tilde{p}_i.$$

In particular, $\max_{1\leq j\leq \widetilde{m}} \widetilde{d}_j = o(\sqrt{\widetilde{m}})$.

Remark 4. We make two observations about the above set of assumptions.

(i) The assumption $\widetilde{d}_1 = 1$ makes the notation in the proofs simpler. It has no other special relevance. Indeed, since $\tilde{p}_1 > 0$, a positive proportion of vertices have degree one when $\widetilde{m}$ is large. Thus, we can always consider the vertex that has the smallest label among all vertices that have degree one.
(ii) We will work with connected graphs with fixed complexity, i.e., for all $\widetilde{m} \geq 1$, the degree sequence $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})}$ will satisfy $\sum_{j\in[\widetilde{m}]} \widetilde{d}_j = 2(\widetilde{m}-1) + 2k$ for some fixed $k \geq 0$. Hence in this case, the assumption $\sum_{i\geq 1} i\,\tilde{p}_i = 2$ is redundant as it follows from the other assumptions.

Let $\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}$ be the set of all **connected**, simple, labeled (by $[\widetilde{m}]$) graphs with degree sequence $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}$ where the vertex labeled j has degree $\widetilde{d}_j$.

Theorem 2.6 (Scaling limit of **connected** graphs with given degree sequence under optimal assumptions)**.** *Consider a sequence of degree sequences* $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})} = (\widetilde{d}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{d}_{\widetilde{m}})$ *satisfying Assumption* 2.5. *In addition, assume that for all* $\widetilde{m}$,

$$\sum_{j\in[\widetilde{m}]} \widetilde{d}_j = 2(\widetilde{m}-1) + 2k$$

for some (fixed) nonnegative integer k. *Sample* $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}$ *uniformly from* $\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}$, *and endow it with the graph distance and the uniform probability measure on vertices. Then there exists a random compact metric measure space* $M^{(k)}$ *such that*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\widetilde{m}}} \mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \frac{1}{\sigma} M^{(k)}$$

in the GHP sense, where $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i\geq 1} i^2\,\tilde{p}_i - 4$ *is the asymptotic variance.*

Remark 5. The limit object $M^{(k)}$ is described explicitly in Construction 3.4.

Our next result concerns enumeration of connected graphs with prescribed degrees.

Theorem 2.7 (Asymptotic number of connected graphs with given degree sequence when the complexity is fixed)**.** *Consider a sequence of degree sequences* $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})} = (\widetilde{d}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{d}_{\widetilde{m}})$ *satisfying Assumption* 2.5. *Assume further that for all* $\widetilde{m}$,

$$\sum_{j\in[\widetilde{m}]} \widetilde{d}_j = 2(\widetilde{m}-1) + 2k$$

for some (fixed) nonnegative integer k. *Let* $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i\geq 1} i^2\,\tilde{p}_i - 4$ *be the asymptotic variance. Then*

$$\lim_{\widetilde{m}} \frac{\left|\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}\right| \times \prod_{i=1}^{\widetilde{m}} \left(\widetilde{d}_i - 1\right)! \times \widetilde{m}^{k/2}}{\left(\widetilde{m} + 2k - 2\right)!} = \frac{\sigma^k}{k!}\, \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{e}(x)\,dx\right)^k\right],$$

where $\mathbf{e}(x)$, $x \in [0,1]$, *is a standard Brownian excursion.*

Remark 6. Let $C(n, n+k)$ denote the number of connected graphs with n labeled vertices and $n+k$ edges. Wright [54] showed that for any fixed $k \geq -1$,

$$C(n, n+k) \sim \rho_k n^{n+(3k-1)/2} \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where the constants ρ_k satisfy a certain recurrence relation. Spencer [50] proved a connection between this purely combinatorial result and a probabilistic object by showing that

$$\rho_k = \frac{1}{(k+1)!}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{e}(x)dx\right)^{k+1}\right], \quad k \geq -1,$$

where $\mathbf{e}(x)$, $x \in [0,1]$, is a standard Brownian excursion. Theorem 2.7 proves the analogue of this result for connected graphs when the degree sequence is fixed.

3. Definitions and limit objects

This section contains basic constructs required to state our main results.

3.1. **Notation and conventions.** For any set A, we write $|A|$ for its cardinality and $\mathbb{1}\{A\}$ for the associated indicator function. Given two intervals $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$, we write $C(A,B)$ for the space of continuous functions $f : A \to B$, equipped with the L_∞-norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x\in A}|f(x)|$. We write $D(A,B)$ for the space of RCLL (right-continuous-left-limit) functions $f : A \to B$, equipped with the Skorohod topology. We use the standard Landau notation of $o(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$ and the corresponding *order in probability* notation $o_P(\cdot)$ and $O_P(\cdot)$. We use $\xrightarrow{\text{P}}$, $\xrightarrow{\text{w}}$ and $\xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}}$ to denote convergence in probability, weak convergence and almost-sure convergence. We say a sequence of events E_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, occur *with high probability* if $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

3.2. **Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov metric.** We mainly follow [1, 4, 19]. All metric spaces under consideration will be compact. Let us recall the Gromov-Hausdorff distance d_{GH} between metric spaces. Fix two metric spaces $X_1 = (X_1, d_1)$ and $X_2 = (X_2, d_2)$. For a subset $C \subseteq X_1 \times X_2$, the distortion of C is defined as

$$\text{dis}(C) := \sup\left\{|d_1(x_1,y_1) - d_2(x_2,y_2)| : (x_1,x_2),(y_1,y_2) \in C\right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

A correspondence C between X_1 and X_2 is a measurable subset of $X_1 \times X_2$ such that for every $x_1 \in X_1$, there exists at least one $x_2 \in X_2$ such that $(x_1,x_2) \in C$ and vice-versa. The Gromov-Hausdorff distance between the two metric spaces (X_1,d_1) and (X_2,d_2) is defined as

$$d_{\text{GH}}(X_1,X_2) = \frac{1}{2}\inf\left\{\text{dis}(C) : C \text{ is a correspondence between } X_1 \text{ and } X_2\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Suppose (X_1,d_1) and (X_2,d_2) are two metric spaces and $p_1 \in X_1$, and $p_2 \in X_2$. Then the *pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance* between $\boldsymbol{X}_1 := (X_1,d_1,p_1)$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_2 := (X_2,d_2,p_2)$ is given by

$$d_{\text{GH}}^{\text{pt}}(\boldsymbol{X}_1,\boldsymbol{X}_2) = \frac{1}{2}\inf\left\{\text{dis}(C) : C \text{ is a correspondence between } X_1 \text{ and } X_2 \text{ and } (p_1,p_2) \in C\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

We will use the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance that also keeps track of associated measures on the corresponding metric spaces. A compact metric measure space (X,d,μ) is a compact metric space (X,d) with an associated finite measure μ on the Borel sigma algebra $\mathscr{B}(X)$. Given two compact metric measure spaces (X_1,d_1,μ_1) and (X_2,d_2,μ_2) and a measure π on the product space $X_1 \times X_2$, the discrepancy of π with respect to μ_1 and μ_2 is defined as

$$D(\pi;\mu_1,\mu_2) := ||\mu_1 - \pi_1|| + ||\mu_2 - \pi_2|| \tag{3.4}$$

where π_1, π_2 are the marginals of π and $||\cdot||$ denotes the total variation of signed measures. Then define the metric d_{GHP} between X_1 and X_2 is defined

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}(X_1,X_2) := \inf\Big\{ \max\Big(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dis}(C),\ D(\pi;\mu_1,\mu_2),\ \pi(C^c)\Big)\Big\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where the infimum is taken over all correspondences C and measures π on $X_1 \times X_2$. As mentioned in the introduction, unless otherwise stated typically the associated measures will be *probability* measures.

Similar to (3.3), we can define a "*pointed Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance*" $d^{\mathrm{pt}}_{\mathrm{GHP}}$ between two metric measure spaces X_1 and X_2 having two distinguished points p_1 and p_2 respectively by taking the infimum in (3.5) over all correspondences C and measures π on $X_1 \times X_2$ such that $(p_1,p_2) \in C$.

Now let $\mathfrak{S}$ be the space of all compact metric measure spaces. The function d_{GHP} is a pseudometric on $\mathfrak{S}$, and defines an equivalence relation $X \sim Y \Leftrightarrow d_{\mathrm{GHP}}(X,Y) = 0$ on $\mathfrak{S}$. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{S}} := \mathfrak{S}/\sim$ be the space of isometry equivalent classes of compact metric measure spaces and $\bar{d}_{\mathrm{GHP}}$ be the induced metric. Then by [1], $(\bar{\mathfrak{S}}, \bar{d}_{\mathrm{GHP}})$ is a complete separable metric space. To ease notation, we will continue to use $(\mathfrak{S}, d_{\mathrm{GHP}})$ instead of $(\bar{\mathfrak{S}}, \bar{d}_{\mathrm{GHP}})$ and $X = (X,d,\mu)$ to denote both the metric space and the corresponding equivalence class.

Since we will be interested in not just one metric space but an infinite sequence of metric spaces, the relevant space will be $\mathfrak{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$ equipped with the product topology inherited from d_{GHP}.

3.3. **Gromov-weak topology.** Here we mainly follow [29]. Introduce an equivalence relation on the space of complete and separable metric spaces that are equipped with a probability measure on the associated Borel σ-algebra by declaring two such spaces (X_1,d_1,μ_1) and (X_2,d_2,μ_2) to be equivalent when there exists an isometry $\psi : \mathrm{support}(\mu_1) \to \mathrm{support}(\mu_2)$ such that $\mu_2 = \psi_*\mu_1 := \mu_1 \circ \psi^{-1}$, i.e., the push-forward of μ_1 under ψ is μ_2. Write $\mathfrak{S}_*$ for the associated space of equivalence classes. As before, we will often ease notation by not distinguishing between a metric space and its equivalence class.

Fix $l \geq 2$, and a complete separable metric space (X,d). Then given a collection of points $\mathbf{x} := (x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_l) \in X^l$, let $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) := (d(x_i,x_j))_{i,j\in[l]}$ denote the symmetric matrix of pairwise distances between the collection of points. A function $\Phi\colon \mathfrak{S}_* \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a polynomial of degree l if there exists a bounded continuous function $\phi\colon \mathbb{R}_+^{l^2} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Phi((X,d,\mu)) := \int \phi(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}))\, d\mu^{\otimes l}(\mathbf{x}). \tag{3.6}$$

Here $\mu^{\otimes l}$ is the l-fold product measure of μ. Let $\mathbf{\Pi}$ denote the space of all polynomials on $\mathfrak{S}_*$.

Definition 3.1 (Gromov-weak topology)**.** *A sequence $(X_n,d_n,\mu_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \mathfrak{S}_*$ is said to converge to $(X,d,\mu) \in \mathfrak{S}_*$ in the Gromov-weak topology if and only if $\Phi((X_n,d_n,\mu_n)) \to \Phi((X,d,\mu))$ for all $\Phi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$.*

In [29, Theorem 1] it is shown that $\mathfrak{S}_*$ is a Polish space under the Gromov-weak topology. It is also shown that, in fact, this topology can be completely metrized using the so-called Gromov-Prokhorov metric.

3.4. **Spaces of trees with edge lengths, leaf weights and root-to-leaf measures.** The rest of this section largely follows [13]. In the proof of the main results we need the following two spaces built on top of the space of discrete trees. The first space $\mathbf{T}_{IJ}$ was formulated in [7, 8] where it was used to study trees spanning a finite number of random points sampled from an inhomogeneous continuum random tree (ICRT). A more general space $\mathbf{T}^*_{IJ}$ was used in the proofs in [13]. The index I in $\mathbf{T}_{IJ}$ and $\mathbf{T}^*_{IJ}$ is needed for the purpose of keeping track of the number of marked "hubs," i.e., vertices of high (or infinite) degrees in such trees (see [7, 8, 13] for a proper definition). For our purpose it will suffice to consider the case $I = 0$. So we only define the space $\mathbf{T}_J := \mathbf{T}_{0J}$ and $\mathbf{T}^*_J := \mathbf{T}^*_{0J}$.

The space $\mathbf{T}_J$: Fix $J \geq 1$. Let $\mathbf{T}_J$ be the space of trees having the following properties:

(a) There are exactly J leaves labeled $1+, \ldots, J+$, and the tree is rooted at another labeled vertex $0+$.
(b) Every edge e has a strictly positive edge length l_e.

A tree $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}_J$ can be viewed as being composed of two parts:
(1) shape($\mathbf{t}$) describing the shape of the tree (including the labels of leaves) but ignoring edge lengths. The set of all possible shapes $\mathbf{T}^{\text{shape}}_J$ is obviously finite for fixed J.
(2) The edge lengths $\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{t}) := (l_e : e \in \mathbf{t})$. Consider the product topology on $\mathbf{T}_J$ consisting of the discrete topology on $\mathbf{T}^{\text{shape}}_J$ and the product topology on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The space $\mathbf{T}^*_J$: We will need a slightly more general space. Along with the two attributes above in $\mathbf{T}_J$, the trees in this space have the following two additional properties. Let $\mathscr{L}(\mathbf{t}) := \{1+, \ldots, J+\}$ denote the collection of non-root leaves in $\mathbf{t}$. Then every leaf $v \in \mathscr{L}(\mathbf{t})$ has the following attributes:

(d) **Leaf weights:** A nonnegative number $A(v)$. Write $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{t}) := (A(v) : v \in \mathscr{L}(\mathbf{t}))$.
(e) **Root-to-leaf measures:** A probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{t},v}$ on the path $[0+, v]$ connecting the root and the leaf v. Here the path is viewed as a line segment pointed at $0+$ and has the usual Euclidean topology. Write $\boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathbf{t}) := (\nu_{\mathbf{t},v} : v \in \mathscr{L}(\mathbf{t}))$ for this collection of probability measures.

In addition to the topology on $\mathbf{T}_J$, the space $\mathbf{T}^*_J$ with these additional two attributes inherits the product topology on $\mathbb{R}^J$ owing to leaf weights and $(d^{\text{pt}}_{\text{GHP}})^J$ owing to the root-to-leaf measures.

Additionally, we include a special element ∂ in $\mathbf{T}^*_J$. This will be useful in the proofs as we will view any rooted tree that does not have exactly J distinct leaves as ∂, which will allow us to work entirely in the space $\mathbf{T}^*_J$.

3.5. **Scaling limits of component sizes at criticality.** The starting point for establishing the metric space scaling limit is understanding the behavior of the component sizes. We first set up some notation. Fix parameters $\alpha, \eta, \beta > 0$, and write $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\alpha, \eta, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$. Let $\{B(s) : s \geq 0\}$ be a standard Brownian motion. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$W^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}(s) := \frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{\alpha} B(s) + \lambda s - \frac{\eta s^2}{2\alpha^3}, \qquad s \geq 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Write $\overline{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}$ for the process reflected at zero:

$$\overline{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}(s) := W^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}(s) - \min_{0 \leq u \leq s} W^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}(u), \qquad s \geq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Consider the metric space,

$$l^2_{\downarrow} := \Big\{\mathbf{x} = (x_i : i \geq 1) : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \ldots \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^2 < \infty\Big\}, \tag{3.9}$$

equipped with the natural metric inherited from l^2. It was shown by Aldous in [6] that the excursions of $\overline{W}^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}$ from zero can be arranged in decreasing order of lengths as

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\lambda) = \big(|\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{(i)}(\lambda)| : i \geq 1\big), \tag{3.10}$$

where $|\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{(i)}(\lambda)|$ is the length of the i-th largest excursion $\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{(i)}(\lambda)$, and further $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\lambda) \in l^2_{\downarrow}$. Let $\mathscr{P}_\beta$ be a rate β Poisson process $\mathbb{R}^2_+$ independent of $W^{\boldsymbol{\mu},\lambda}(\cdot)$. For each $i \geq 1$, write $N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{(i)}(\lambda)$ for the number of points of $\mathscr{P}_\beta$ that fall under the excursion $\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{(i)}(\lambda)$.

Aldous in [6] studied the maximal components of the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime and proved a remarkable result that says that the sizes of the maximal components scaled by $n^{-2/3}$ and the number of surplus edges in the maximal components of $\mathrm{ERRG}(n^{-1} + \lambda n^{-4/3})$ converge jointly in distribution to $\big(\big(|\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{er}}}_{(i)}(\lambda)|, N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{er}}}_{(i)}(\lambda)\big) : i \geq 1\big)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{er}} = (1,1,1)$. This result has since been generalized to a number of other random graph models. In the context of graphs with given degree sequence, Nachmias and Peres [46] studied critical percolation on random regular graphs; Riordan [49] analyzed the configuration model with bounded degrees; Joseph [38] considered i.i.d. degrees. The strongest possible such result under minimal assumptions was obtained in [25]. We will state a weaker version of this result next.

Theorem 3.2 ([25])**.** *Consider a degree sequence* $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^{(n)}$ *satisfying Assumption* 2.3 *with the limiting random variable D and define* $\sigma_r := \mathbb{E}[D^r]$, $r = 1,2,3$. *Write* $\mathscr{C}_{(i)}(\lambda)$ *for the i-th largest connected component of* $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ *(or* $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$*). Let*

$$N^n_{(i)}(\lambda) := \#\ \textit{edges in}\ \mathscr{C}^n_{(i)}(\lambda) - (|\mathscr{C}_{(i)}(\lambda)| - 1)$$

denote the number of surplus edges in $\mathscr{C}_{(i)}(\lambda)$*. Then as* $n \to \infty$*,*

$$\Big(\big(n^{-2/3}|\mathscr{C}^n_{(i)}(\lambda)|, N^n_{(i)}(\lambda)\big) : i \geq 1\Big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \boldsymbol{Z}^D(\lambda) := \Big(\big(|\gamma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}_{(i)}(\lambda)|, N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}_{(i)}(\lambda)\big) : i \geq 1\Big)$$

with respect to product topology. Here $\boldsymbol{\mu}_D = (\alpha_D, \eta_D, \beta_D)$ *is given by*

$$\alpha_D = \sigma_1,\ \ \eta_D = \sigma_3\sigma_1 - \sigma_2^2,\ \ \textit{and}\ \ \beta_D = 1/\sigma_1.$$

This result, in a stronger form, can be found in [25, Theorem 2 and Remark 5]. We will use this result in the next section to describe the limiting metric measure spaces arising in Section 2.

3.6. **The limiting metric measure spaces.** A compact metric space (X,d) is called a *real tree* [27, 40] if between every two points there is a unique geodesic such that this path is also the only non self-intersecting path between the two points. Functions encoding excursions from zero can be used to construct such metric spaces via a simple procedure. We describe this construction next.

For $0 < a < b < \infty$, an *excursion* on $[a,b]$ is a continuous function $h \in C([a,b],\mathbb{R})$ with $h(a) = 0 = h(b)$ and $h(t) > 0$ for $t \in (a,b)$. The length of such an excursion is $b-a$. For $l \in (0,\infty)$, let

$\mathscr{E}_l$ be the space of all excursions on the interval $[0,l]$. Given an excursion $h \in \mathscr{E}_l$, one can construct a real tree as follows. Define the pseudo-metric d_h on $[0,l]$:

$$d_h(s,t) := h(s) + h(t) - 2 \inf_{u\in[s,t]} h(u), \text{ for } s,t \in [0,l]. \tag{3.11}$$

Define the equivalence relation $s \sim t \Leftrightarrow d_h(s,t) = 0$. Let $[0,l]/\sim$ denote the corresponding quotient space and consider the metric space $\mathscr{T}_h := ([0,l]/\sim, \bar{d}_h)$, where $\bar{d}_h$ is the metric on the equivalence classes induced by d_h. Then $\mathscr{T}_h$ is a real tree ([27, 40]). Let $q_h : [0,l] \to \mathscr{T}_h$ be the canonical projection and write $\mu_{\mathscr{T}_h}$ for the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on $[0,l]$ onto $\mathscr{T}_h$ via q_h. Further, we assume that $\mathscr{T}_h$ is rooted at $\rho := q_h(0)$. Equipped with $\mu_{\mathscr{T}_h}$, $\mathscr{T}_h$ is now a rooted compact metric measure space. Note that by construction, for any $x \in \mathscr{T}_h$, the function h is constant on $q_h^{-1}(x)$. Thus for each $x \in [0,l]$, we write $\mathrm{ht}(x) = h(q_h^{-1}(x))$ for the height of this vertex.

The Brownian continuum random tree defined below is a fundamental object in the literature of random real trees.

Definition 3.3 (Aldous's continuum random tree [5])**.** *Let* $\mathbf{e}$ *be a standard Brownian excursion on* $[0,1]$*. Construct the random compact real tree* $\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}$ *as in* (3.11) *with* $h = 2\mathbf{e}$*. The associated measure* $\mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}$ *is supported on the collection of leaves of* $\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}$ *almost surely.*

Write ν for the law of a standard Brownian excursion on the space of excursions on $[0,1]$ namely $\mathscr{E}_1$. For $k \geq 0$, let $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}$ be a random excursion with distribution $\tilde{\nu}_k$ given via the following Radon-Nikodym density with respect to ν:

$$\frac{d\tilde{\nu}_k}{d\nu}(h) = \frac{\left[\int_0^1 h(u)\,du\right]^k}{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{e}(u)\,du\right)^k\right]} = \frac{\left(\int_{\mathscr{T}_h} \mathrm{ht}(x)\mu_{\mathscr{T}_h}(dx)\right)^k}{\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathscr{T}_\mathbf{e}} \mathrm{ht}(x)\mu_{\mathscr{T}_\mathbf{e}}(dx)\right]^k}, \qquad h \in \mathscr{E}_1. \tag{3.12}$$

Construction 3.4 (The space $M^{(k)}$)**.** *Fix* $k \geq 0$.

(a) *Let* $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}$ *be as above, and write* $\mathscr{T}^\star = \mathscr{T}_{2\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}}$*. Let* $\mu_{\mathscr{T}^\star}$ *denote the associated measure.*

(b) *Conditional on* $\mathscr{T}^\star$*, sample* k *leaves* $\{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ *in an i.i.d. fashion from* $\mathscr{T}^\star$ *with density proportional to* $\mathrm{ht}(x)\mu_{\mathscr{T}^\star}(dx)$.

(c) *Conditional on the two steps above, for each of the sampled leaves* x_i*, sample a point* y_i *uniformly at random on the line* $[\rho, x_i]$*. Identify* x_i *and* y_i*, i.e., introduce the equivalence relation* $x_i \sim y_i$*,* $1 \leq i \leq k$*, and form the quotient space* $\mathscr{T}_\star/\sim$.

Set $M^{(k)}$ *to be the resultant (compact) random metric measure space.*

Next recall the definition of $\boldsymbol{Z}^D(\lambda)$ from Theorem 3.2.

Construction 3.5 (The sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda)$)**.**

(a) *Sample* $\boldsymbol{Z}^D(\lambda) = \left(\left(|\gamma_{(i)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda)|, N_{(i)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda)\right) : i \geq 1\right)$*. For simplicity, write*

$$\xi_i = |\gamma_{(i)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda)|, \text{ and } N_i = N_{(i)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda).$$

(b) *Conditional on* $\boldsymbol{Z}^D(\lambda)$*, construct the spaces* $S_i := M^{(N_i)}$ *independently for* $i \geq 1$.

Set

$$\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda) = \left(M_1^D(\lambda), M_2^D(\lambda), \ldots\right), \text{ where } M_i^D(\lambda) = \frac{\alpha_D\sqrt{\xi_i}}{\sqrt{\eta_D}} \cdot S_i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Note that the sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^D(\lambda)$ of limiting spaces depends only on the first three moments of the random variable D (which is also true for $\boldsymbol{Z}^D(\lambda)$–the scaling limit of the component sizes and the number of surplus edges).

Finally, let a_0 be as in theorem 2.1. Define

$$\lambda_{\rm vac} = \frac{a_0(r-2)^2}{r(r-1)}, \text{ and } p_{\rm vac} = \exp\Big(-\frac{r\ln(r-1)}{(r-2)}\Big), \tag{3.13}$$

and let $D_{\rm vac}$ be the mixture random variable

$$D_{\rm vac} = (1-p_{\rm vac})\cdot\delta_0 + p_{\rm vac}\cdot \text{Binomial}\Big(r, \frac{1}{r-1}\Big). \tag{3.14}$$

Construction 3.6 (The sequence $\boldsymbol{M}^{\rm vac}(a_0)$)**.** *Set*

$$\boldsymbol{M}^{\rm vac}(a_0) := \boldsymbol{M}^{D_{\rm vac}}\big(\lambda_{\rm vac}\big).$$

Remark 7. The Erdős-Rényi scaling limit identified in [3] can be recovered by taking the limiting random variable to be $D_{\rm er} \sim$ Poisson(1), i.e., the scaling limit of ERRG$(n^{-1}+\lambda n^{-4/3})$ (after rescaling the graph distance by $n^{-1/3}$) is given by

$$\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm er}(\lambda) := \boldsymbol{M}^{D_{\rm er}}(\lambda).$$

(Note that in this case, $\alpha_{D_{\rm er}} = \eta_{D_{\rm er}} = \beta_{D_{\rm er}} = 1$.) The result for ERRG$(n^{-1}+\lambda n^{-4/3})$ can be obtained from our results as a special case of Theorem 2.4 by observing the following two facts:

(i) The (random) degree sequence of ERRG$(n^{-1}+\lambda n^{-4/3})$ satisfies Assumption 2.3 with limiting random variable $D_{\rm er}$.
(ii) Conditional on the event where the degree sequence equals $\mathbf{d}$, ERRG$(n^{-1}+\lambda n^{-4/3})$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$.

4. Discussion

Here we briefly discuss related work, the relevance of the work in this paper and possible extensions and questions raised by this work.

(a) **Graphs with prescribed degree distribution:** Graphs with prescribed degree sequence have played an integral part in probabilistic combinatorics over the last decade and have also been heavily used in the applied fields including epidemic modeling [17, 39, 47] community detection and clustering [28] and so on. In the context of this paper, the critical point for existence of a giant component was established in [44]. When the degree sequence results in trees, under suitable assumptions on the degree sequence, Broutin and Marckert in [18] showed that these trees appropriately normalized converge to Aldous's continuum random tree; this result will show up in a number of our proofs.
(b) **Critical random graphs:** In the context of continuum scaling limits of maximal components in the critical regime, the only other result for the configuration model was derived in [12]; here using completely different techniques, critical percolation on the **supercritical** regime of the configuration model where the degree distribution has exponential tails was studied. Associated dynamic versions of this model were constructed and coupled appropriately to Aldous's multiplicative coalescent. A general universality principle also derived in the same paper then resulted in the scaling limits of maximal components at critical percolation. The techniques in that paper, however, do not extend to this work.

Here we need start directly with a **critical** prescribed degree sequence; the proof techniques in this paper are completely different and use a combinatorial description of the uniform distribution on the space of **connected** simple graphs with a prescribed degree sequence.

(c) **Vacant sets and random interlacements on general random graphs:** With regards to vacant sets, as stated Theorem 2.1 applies to random regular graphs. However as elucidated in Conjecture 2.2, we believe that analogous results hold for the VSRW problem on $\mathcal{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ or $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ constructed using general degree sequence satisfying the hypothesis of Conjecture 2.2. Let us now address the two clarifications described in Remark 2. Assuming one can establish the critical point for VSRW for such graphs,

(i) Finite third moment: we conjecture that one can construct a (model dependent) random variable D^*_{vac} (analogous to (3.14) for the random regular graph) and λ^*_{vac} a function of both the distribution of D and a_0 (analogous to (3.13)) such that the maximal connected components in the critical regime with edges rescaled by $n^{-1/3}$ converge to $\boldsymbol{M}^{D^*_{\mathrm{vac}}}(\lambda^*_{\mathrm{vac}})$. This explicates the "universality" phenomenon we expect in this regime.

(ii) Infinite third moment regime: In [13], various results related to scaling limits of maximal components in Aldous's multiplicative coalescent were established in terms of tilted inhomogeneous continuum random trees. One ramification of these results ([13, Theorem 1.2]) is the continuum scaling limits of the maximal components in the critical regime of the so-called Norros-Reitu model where the driving weight sequence is assumed to have heavy tails with exponent $\tau \in (3,4)$. A full description of this random graph model as well as the corresponding limits is beyond the scope of this paper, we refer the interested reader to [13]. We conjecture that the maximal components in the critical regime for the VSRW model are described by the limit objects derived in [13].

Let us now say a few words on how one can go about proving the above conjecture (at least in the finite third moment setting). As will become evident from the proofs, the result follows owing to the following three ingredients **(i)** Theorem 2.4; **(ii)** a result of Cooper and Frieze [23] which expresses the annealed measure for the vacant set problem in terms of the random graphs with prescribed degree sequence; **(iii)** refined bounds on the degree sequence of the vacant in the critical scaling window derived in [20]. Parts (i) and (ii) continue to hold for the vacant set problem for random walks on general graphs with prescribed degree sequence. Thus to extend our results to the vacant set problem for general graphs, all one needs is an extension of the refined bounds in (iii) to random walks on general graphs.

(d) **Proof techniques:** The techniques used in this paper differ from the standard techniques used to show convergence of such random discrete objects to limiting random tree like metric spaces. One standard technique (used in [3, 14]) is to construct an exploration process of the discrete object of interest that converges to the exploration process of a continuum random tree (see [27, 40] for beautiful treatments), and encode the "surplus" edges as a random point process falling under the exploration, and show that this point process converges to a Poisson point process in the limit. In this work, we use a different technique that requires less work. We first prove convergence of the object of interest in the Gromov-weak topology, essentially showing that for each fixed $k \geq 2$, the distance matrix constructed from k randomly sampled vertices converges in distribution to the

distance matrix constructed from k points appropriately sampled from the limiting structure. This result, coupled with a global lower mass bound implies via general theory [9] that convergence occurs in the stronger Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov sense. In the context of critical random graphs, this technique was first used in [13] to analyze the so-called rank-one critical inhomogeneous random graph.

5. Preliminary constructions

In this section we set up important notation related to plane trees that will be used throughout the proof.

5.1. **Plane trees: Basic functionals and exploration.** Throughout the sequel we will let $\boldsymbol{t}$ denote a **plane rooted** tree. We use ρ to denote the root and think of this as the original progenitor of the tree so that every vertex other than the root has a unique parent. Write $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t})$ for the set of leaves of $\boldsymbol{t}$. For each non-root vertex $u \in \boldsymbol{t}$, let $\overleftarrow{u}$ denote the parent of u. Let $[\rho, u]$ (resp. $[\rho, u)$) denote the ancestral line of u including (resp. excluding) u. Thus $[\rho, u) = [\rho, \overleftarrow{u}]$. Using the planar embedding, any plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ can be explored in a depth-first manner (our convention is to go to the "leftmost" child first). Let $\prec_{\mathrm{DF}}$ be the linear order on vertices of a plane tree induced by a depth-first exploration starting from the root, i.e., $x \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} y$ if x is explored before y in a depth-first search of the plane tree.

Definition 5.1 (Admissible pairs of leaves)**.** *For leaves $u, v \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t})$, we say that the* **ordered** *pair (u, v) is* **admissible** *if*

$$\overleftarrow{v} \in [\rho, \overleftarrow{u}), \text{ and } \overleftarrow{u} \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} \overleftarrow{v}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})$ denote the set of admissible pairs of $\boldsymbol{t}$.

See Figure 5.1 for an example of an admissible pair. We introduce a linear order $\ll$ on $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})$



FIGURE 5.1. An example of an admissible pair of leaves.

as follows: $(u_1, v_1) \ll (u_2, v_2)$ if either $\overleftarrow{u}_1 \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} \overleftarrow{u}_2$ or if $\overleftarrow{u}_1 = \overleftarrow{u}_2$ and $\overleftarrow{v}_1 \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} \overleftarrow{v}_2$. For $u \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t})$, define

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t}, u) := \{v \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t}) \,:\, (u, v) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})\}, \text{ and } f_{\boldsymbol{t}}(u) := |\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t}, u)|. \tag{5.1}$$

Note that

$$|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})| = \sum_{u \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t})} f_{\boldsymbol{t}}(u). \tag{5.2}$$

For any plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and a vertex u, define

$$\boldsymbol{B}_1(\boldsymbol{t},u)=\left\{v\,:\,\overleftarrow{v}\in[\rho,u)\right\},\ \text{and}\ \boldsymbol{B}_2(\boldsymbol{t},u)=\left\{v\,:\,\overleftarrow{\overleftarrow{v}}\in[\rho,u)\right\},$$

where ρ is the root of $\boldsymbol{t}$. Thus for any $u\in\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{t})$,

$$f_{\boldsymbol{t}}(u)=|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t},u)|\le|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\boldsymbol{t},u)|. \tag{5.3}$$

For any plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and a vertex u, define

$$\boldsymbol{B}_1^-(\boldsymbol{t},u)=\left\{v\,:\,\overleftarrow{v}\in[\rho,u),\ u\prec_{\mathrm{DF}}v\right\},\ \text{and}\ \boldsymbol{B}_1^+(\boldsymbol{t},u)=\left\{v\,:\,\overleftarrow{v}\in[\rho,u),\ v\prec_{\mathrm{DF}}u\right\}.$$

So if our convention is to explore the children of a vertex from left to right in a depth-first search, then $\boldsymbol{B}_1^-(\boldsymbol{t},u)$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{B}_1^+(\boldsymbol{t},u)$) is the collection of vertices that are at distance one from the path $[\rho,u)$ and lie on the right (resp. left) side of $[\rho,u)$.

Now fix $k\ge1$. Define

$$\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})=\Big\{\big\{(u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_k,v_k)\big\}\ :\ (u_j,v_j)\in\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})\ \text{and}\ u_1,v_1,\dots,u_k,v_k\ \text{are}\ 2k\ \text{distinct leaves}\Big\}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})$ be the collection of all such ordered k-tuples of admissible pairs. Clearly

$$\boldsymbol{A}_1(\boldsymbol{t})=\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t}),\ |\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})|=k!\times|\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})|,\ \text{and}\ |\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})|\le|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})|^k.$$

For later use, define $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})^k=\otimes_{i=1}^k\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})$ be the k-fold Cartesian product of $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})$. For a plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and a vertex u, let $\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{t},u)$ be the plane subtree (with the root and u marked) whose vertex set is given by

$$V=\left\{v\ \middle|\ v\in[\rho,u],\ \text{or}\ \overleftarrow{v}\in[\rho,u)\right\}.$$

Let $\mathrm{Anc}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{t},u)$ be the plane subtree (with the root and u marked) whose vertex set is given by

$$V^{(2)}=\left\{v\ \middle|\ v\in[\rho,u],\ \text{or}\ \overleftarrow{v}\in[\rho,u),\ \text{or}\ \overleftarrow{\overleftarrow{v}}\in[\rho,u)\right\}.$$

Given a plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$, write $\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{t})=(c_v(\boldsymbol{t}):v\in\boldsymbol{t})$, where $c_v(\boldsymbol{t})$ is the number of children of v in $\boldsymbol{t}$. Further write $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{t})=(s_i(\boldsymbol{t}):i\ge0)$ for the **empirical children distribution (ECD)** of $\boldsymbol{t}$. Namely,

$$s_i(\boldsymbol{t}):=\{v\in\boldsymbol{t}:c_v(\boldsymbol{t})=i\},\qquad i\ge0.$$

Given a sequence of integers $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_i:i\ge0)$, we say that the sequence is a *tenable* ECD for a tree if there exists a finite plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ with $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{t})=\boldsymbol{s}$. It is easy to check $\boldsymbol{s}$ is tenable if and only if $s_i\ge0$ for all i with $s_0\ge1$, and

$$\sum_{i\ge0}s_i=1+\sum_{i\ge0}is_i<\infty.$$

Given a tenable ECD $\boldsymbol{s}$, let $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ denote the set of all plane trees having ECD $\boldsymbol{s}$.

If $\boldsymbol{f}$ is a finite forest of plane trees, define the ECD $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{f})$ analogously. Note that for any sequence of integers $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_i:i\ge0)$ satisfying

$$s_i\ge0,\ \sum_i is_i<\infty,\ \text{and}\ k(\boldsymbol{s}):=\sum_i s_i-\sum_i is_i\ge1,$$

there exists a forest with ECD $\boldsymbol{s}$. Such a forest has exactly $k(\boldsymbol{s})$ many trees. Given such a sequence $\boldsymbol{s}$, let $\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ denote the set of all plane forests with **ranked roots** having ECD $\boldsymbol{s}$. Thus each forest in $\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ comes with an ordering of the roots so it makes sense talking about the "first" tree of the forest, the "second" tree etc.

Finally fix $k\ge1$ and let $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}$ denote the set of all pairs $(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})$. For a plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}=\big\{(u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_k,v_k)\big\}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})$, let $\mathscr{I}(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x})$ be the rooted space obtained by adding an edge between $\overleftarrow{u}_j$ and $\overleftarrow{v}_j$, and deleting u_j,v_j and the two edges incident to

them for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. (See Figure 5.2 for an example of this.) We endow the space $\mathscr{I}(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{x})$ with the graph distance and the uniform probability measure on all vertices. Similarly if $\boldsymbol{t}^{\text{lab}}$ is a labeled plane tree and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t}^{\text{lab}})$, then $\mathscr{I}(\boldsymbol{t}^{\text{lab}}, \boldsymbol{x})$ is the **labeled** graph obtained by following the same construction and retaining the labels.



FIGURE 5.2. An example of the operation $\mathscr{I}$ applied on the tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and admissible pair (u, v) in Figure 5.1.

Finally for a plane tree $\boldsymbol{t}$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = \big((u_1, v_1), \ldots, (u_k, v_k)\big) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{t})^k$, let $\mathscr{Q}(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{x})$ be the space obtained by identifying u_j and $\overleftarrow{\overleftarrow{v}}_j$ for $1 \le j \le k$. We endow the space $\mathscr{Q}(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{x})$ with the graph distance and the push-forward of the uniform probability measure on $\boldsymbol{t}$.

6. PROPERTIES OF PLANE TREES

We start by describing the setting and assumptions. Assume that for each $m \ge 1$, $\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)} = (s_i : i \ge 0)$ (where $\sum s_i = m$) is a tenable ECD for a tree. Analogous to Assumption 2.5, we make the following assumption on $\{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)} : m \ge 1\}$:

Assumption 6.1. *There exists a pmf* $(p_0, p_1, \ldots)$ *with*

$$p_0 > 0, \quad \sum_{i \ge 1} i p_i = 1, \quad \text{and} \sum_{i \ge 1} i^2 p_i < \infty$$

such that

$$\frac{s_i}{m} \to p_i \ \text{ for } \ i \ge 0, \ \text{ and } \ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \ge 0} i^2 s_i \to \sum_{i \ge 1} i^2 p_i.$$

In particular, $\Delta_m := \max\{i : s_i \ne 0\} = o(\sqrt{m})$.

We will write $\sigma^2 = \sum_i i^2 p_i - 1$ *for the variance associated with the pmf* $(p_0, p_1, \ldots)$.

Then the following was shown in [18].

Theorem 6.2 ([18, Theorem 1])**.** *Let* $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ *be a uniform element of* $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ *endowed with the with the* **uniform probability measure on** m **vertices** *and viewed as a metric measure space. Under Assumption* 6.1*, as* $m \to \infty$*,*

$$\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{m}} \mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}} \xrightarrow{\text{w}} \mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}$$

in the GHP sense (see Definition 3.3*).*

Remark 8. In [18, Theorem 1], the convergence is stated to hold in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense. However, it is easy to see that the proof in fact implies convergence in the GHP sense.

The following technical lemma collects all the ingredients necessary for proving our main results.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ be a uniform plane tree with ECD $\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}$. Under Assumption* 6.1 *the following assertions hold.*

(i) *For each $k \geq 1$, we can construct independent random vectors $(U_m^{(1)}, V_m^{(1)}), \ldots, (U_m^{(k)}, V_m^{(k)})$ such that $U_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$ have uniform distribution on the s_0 leaves and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$ have uniform distribution on the m vertices, and*

$$m^{-1/2} d_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}\big(U_m^{(j)}, V_m^{(j)}\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, k.$$

In particular,

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathcal{T}^{\mathscr{L}}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}\Big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0,$$

where $\mathcal{T}^{\mathscr{L}}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ denotes the metric measure space obtained when the underlying tree is endowed with the uniform probability measure on the set of leaves $\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})$. (Recall that the measure on the space $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ is the uniform probability measure on **all** *vertices.)*

(ii) *Recall the definition of an admissible pair of leaves (Definition* 5.1*) and of the function $f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}$ (Equation* (5.1)*). Let U_m be uniformly distributed over $\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})$. Then for every $k \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_m \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})|}{s_0\sqrt{m}}\right)^k \leq \sup_m \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(U_m)}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^k < \infty.$$

(iii) *For every $k \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{1}{m^{3k/2}}\Big(\big|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big|^k - \big|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big|\Big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0.$$

(iv) *Let $k \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$. Consider independent random variables $U_m^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$, where $U_m^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ have uniform distribution on the s_0 leaves of $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$, and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$ have uniform distribution on the m vertices.*

If the subtree of $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ spanned by the root ρ and $U_m^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$ does not have $(k+\ell)$ distinct leaves, then set $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V}) = \partial$. Otherwise set $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V})$ to be the subtree of $\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ spanned by the root ρ and $U_m^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$, and view it as an element of $\mathbf{T}^*_{k+\ell}$ as in Section 3.4 *via the following prescription: For $1 \leq i \leq k$, attach the "leaf value" $m^{-1/2} f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(U_m^{(i)})$ to $U_m^{(i)}$. Endow $[\rho, U_m^{(i)}]$ with a probability measure by assigning mass $p_x^{(i)}$ to each $x \in [\rho, U_m^{(i)})$, where*

$$p_x^{(i)} := \frac{\#\Big\{v \in \boldsymbol{A}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}, U_m^{(i)}\big) \;\Big|\; \overleftarrow{v} = x\Big\}}{f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(U_m^{(i)})}.$$

(The leaf values and root-to-leaf measures attached to $V_m^{(j)}$, $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, are irrelevant in our proof and can be taken to be zero and $\delta_{\{\rho\}}$ respectively.)

Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \frac{1}{\sigma}\mathcal{T}_{k,\ell},$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{k,\ell}$ is the random element of $\mathbf{T}^*_{k+\ell}$ constructed as follows: The shape of $\mathcal{T}_{k,\ell}$ is that of the subtree of $\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}$ spanned by $(k+\ell)$ points $x_1, \ldots, x_{k+\ell}$ sampled independently according to the mass measure $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}$. The leaf weight attached to x_i is $p_0\sigma \cdot \mathrm{ht}(x_i)/2$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, and the measure on $[\rho, x_i]$ is the normalized line measure.

(v) *The following joint convergence holds:*

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}, \frac{|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})|}{s_0\sqrt{m}}\Big) \xrightarrow{\text{w}} \Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}, \frac{p_0\sigma}{2}\int_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}} \text{ht}(x)\, \mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}(dx)\Big)$$

with respect to product topology induced by GHP topology on the first coordinate and Euclidean topology on the second coordinate.

6.1. **Proof of Lemma 6.3**(i)**.** Consider m vertices labeled $1,\ldots,m$. Let $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ be the set of plane trees where vertices labeled $1,\ldots,s_0$ are leaves, vertices labeled $s_0+1,\ldots,s_0+s_1$ have one child,..., vertices labeled $(m-s_\Delta+1),\ldots,m$ have Δ many children. For convenience, denote by c_j the number of children of the vertex labeled j. We will now describe a way of generating a tree uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$.

Let π be a uniform permutation on $[m]$. Let

$$S(j) := \sum_{i=1}^{j}(c_{\pi(i)}-1),\ j=1,\ldots,m,\ \text{ and }\ F(x) = S(\lfloor mx\rfloor),\quad 0\le x\le 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Extend the definition of π periodically by letting $\pi(j) := \pi(j \mod m+1)$. Let i_0 denote the location of the first minima of $\{S(j): 1\le j\le m\}$ and consider the Vervaat transform w.r.t. this location:

$$S^{\text{exc}}(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{j}\big(c_{\pi(i_0+i)}-1\big),\quad 1\le j\le m,\ \text{ and set } F^{\text{exc}}(x) = S^{\text{exc}}(\lfloor mx\rfloor),\quad 0\le x\le 1. \tag{6.2}$$

Let $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ be the labeled tree whose Łukasiewicz walk is $F^{\text{exc}}(\lfloor mx\rfloor),\ x\in[0,1]$. Note that $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ can be constructed sequentially from F^{exc}, and further every interval $((i-1)/m, i/m]$, $1\le i\le m$ corresponds to a unique vertex in the exploration process. Let $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-}$ be the tree obtained by removing all labels from $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ and $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-}$ be as above.*

(a) $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}} \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}})$.

(b) $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-} \overset{\text{d}}{=} \mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$, *i.e.*, $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-} \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})$.

Proof: Each of the $(m-1)!$ rotation classes of the $m!$ permutations gives rise to a unique F^{exc}. Since there is a bijection between $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ and the possible realizations of F^{exc},

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}} = \boldsymbol{t}^{\text{lab}}) = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}|}\ \text{ for any }\ \boldsymbol{t}^{\text{lab}}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-} = \boldsymbol{t}\big) = \frac{\prod_{i\ge0}s_i!}{(m-1)!} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|}\ \text{ for any }\ \boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}.$$

■

We now state a useful concentration inequality.

Lemma 6.5. *There exist universal constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $m\ge1$ and probability vector $\boldsymbol{p} := (p_1,\ldots,p_m)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)} - \frac{j}{m}\Big| \ge x\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\Big) \le \exp\big(-c_1 x\log\log x\big),\ \textit{for}\ x\ge c_2,$$

where π is a uniform permutation on $[m]$, and $\sigma(\boldsymbol{p}) := \sqrt{p_1^2+\ldots+p_m^2}$.

Proof: The result is essentially contained in [13, Lemma 4.9], and we only outline how to extract the result from its proof. We can work with π generated in the following way: let $X_1,\dots,X_m$ be i.i.d. Unif[0,1], and set $\pi(i)=j_i$, where $X_{j_1}<\ldots<X_{j_m}$. Write $X_{(i)}=X_{j_i}$. Then

$$\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}-\frac{j}{m}\Big)\le\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}-X_{(j)}\Big)+\max_{j\in[m]}\Big|X_{(j)}-\frac{j}{m}\Big|. \tag{6.3}$$

By the DKW inequality [42],

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\Big|X_{(j)}-\frac{j}{m}\Big|\ge\sigma(\mathbf{p})x\Big)\le 2\exp\Big(-2m\cdot\big(\sigma(\mathbf{p})x\big)^2\Big)\le 2\exp\big(-2x^2\big), \tag{6.4}$$

where the last step uses the inequality: $m\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})^2\ge(\sum_i p_i)^2=1$. From [13, Equations (4.14) and (4.15)] we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}-X_{(j)}\Big)\ge x\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\Big)\le\exp\big(-c_3x\log\log x\big),\ \text{ for }\ x\ge c_4. \tag{6.5}$$

Combining (6.3), (6.4), and (6.5), it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}-\frac{j}{m}\Big)\ge x\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\Big)\le\exp\big(-c_5x\log\log x\big),\ \text{ for }\ x\ge c_6. \tag{6.6}$$

Now note that

$$\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(\frac{j}{m}-\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}\Big)\le\max_{j\in[m]}\Big(X_{(j)}-\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}\Big)+\max_{j\in[m]}\Big|X_{(j)}-\frac{j}{m}\Big|.$$

Further, the arguments used in the proof of [13, Equation (4.15)] can be used to prove a tail bound similar to (6.5) for $\max_{j\in[m]}\big(X_{(j)}-\sum_{i=1}^{j}p_{\pi(i)}\big)$. Combining this observation with (6.6) yields the desired result. ■

Lemma 6.6. *For each $m\ge1$, let $\boldsymbol{p}=\boldsymbol{p}^{(m)}=(p_1^{(m)},\dots,p_m^{(m)})$ be a probability vector such that $p_{\max}\to0$ as $m\to\infty$. Then for each $k\ge1$, we can construct independent random vectors $(U_m^{(1)},V_m^{(1)}),\dots,(U_m^{(k)},V_m^{(k)})$ on $\mathscr{T}^{\mathrm{lab}}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}$ such that $U_m^{(j)}$, $j=1,\dots,k$ are distributed according $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $V_m^{(j)}$, $j=1,\dots,k$ have uniform distribution on the m vertices, and*

$$m^{-1/2}d_{\mathscr{T}^{\mathrm{lab}}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}\big(U_m^{(j)},V_m^{(j)}\big)\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0\ \text{ for } j=1,\dots,k.$$

Proof: Recall from around (6.1) the permutation π used to construct $\mathscr{T}^{\mathrm{lab}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$, and set

$$G(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor mx\rfloor}p_{\pi(i+i_0+1)},\ \ x\in[0,1],$$

where as before i_0 is the location of the first minima of $\{S(j):j\in[m]\}$. Let $\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})$ be as in Lemma 6.5. Then $\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\ge p_{\max}\ge1/m$. Hence Lemma 6.5 implies

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{x\in[0,1]}\Big|G(x)-x\Big|\ge y\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\Big)\le\exp\big(-C_1y\log\log y\big),\ \ y\ge C_2. \tag{6.7}$$

Since $\sigma(\mathbf{p})\le\sqrt{p_{\max}}\to0$ by assumption, we get, in particular,

$$\sup_{u\in[0,1]}|G^{-1}(u)-u|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0. \tag{6.8}$$

Let $X \sim \text{Unif}[0,1]$. Let $V_m^{(1)}$ (resp. $U_m^{(1)}$) be the point on $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$ corresponding to X (resp. $G^{-1}(X)$). Then $V_m^{(1)}$ has uniform distribution on the m vertices, and $U_m^{(1)}$ is distributed according to $\boldsymbol{p}$. Let H_m be the height function of $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}$. Then

$$\Big| d_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}}\big(U_m^{(1)}, V_m^{(1)}\big) - \Big(H_m\big(G^{-1}(X)\big) + H_m(X) - 2\min{}^{\star} H_m(u) \Big) \Big| \le 2,$$

where $\min^{\star}$ denotes minimum taken over the interval $[G^{-1}(X) \wedge X, G^{-1}(X) \vee X]$. Now [18, Proposition 5 and Lemma 7] imply that the random function $m^{-1/2} H_m(\cdot)$ converges weakly to the continuous function $2\mathbf{e}/\sigma$ under the usual Skorohod topology on $D[0,1]$. Since $|G^{-1}(X) - X| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$, we conclude that

$$m^{-1/2} d_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}}}\big(U_m^{(1)}, V_m^{(1)}\big) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.$$

Taking k independent copies of X and repeating the same argument completes the proof. ■

Completing the proof of Lemma 6.3(i)**:** By Lemma 6.4, $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}} \overset{\text{d}}{=} \mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\text{lab}-}$. Thus the claim follows by an application of Lemma 6.6 with the choice

$$p_i = \frac{\mathbb{1}\{c_i = 0\}}{s_0}.$$

■

6.2. **Proof of Lemma 6.3**(ii)**.** We start with the following set of estimates.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}$ be a tenable ECD for a forest of plane trees, and let*

$$\tilde{z} = \sum_i \tilde{s}_i - \sum_i i\tilde{s}_i, \;\; \tilde{\Delta} = \max_i \{i : \tilde{s}_i \neq 0\}, \;\; \textit{and} \;\; \tilde{m} := \sum_i \tilde{s}_i,$$

i.e., $\tilde{z}$ is the number of roots, $\tilde{\Delta}$ is the maximum number of children, and $\tilde{m}$ is the total number of vertices in any forest in $\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}}$. Sample a forest uniformly from $\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}}$, and let X_j denote the number of children of the root of the j-th tree, $1 \le j \le \tilde{z}$. Then for any $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r \ge 1$ and $1 \le j_1 < \ldots < j_r \le \tilde{z}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[X_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \times \ldots \times X_{j_r}^{\sigma_r} \Big] \le r 2^r \Big(\sum_i \frac{i^2 \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}} \Big)^r \Big(1 + \frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{\tilde{z}} \Big) (\tilde{\Delta})^{\sigma_1 + \ldots + \sigma_r - r}, \tag{6.9}$$

whenever $r \le \tilde{m}/2$. As a consequence the sum of children of all roots in the randomly sampled forest satisfies the moment bound

$$\mathbb{E}\big[X_1 + \ldots + X_{\tilde{z}} \big]^k \le K_k \Big(1 + \frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{\tilde{z}} \Big) \sum_{r=1}^{k} \tilde{z}^r \Big(\sum_i \frac{i^2 \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}} \Big)^r \tilde{\Delta}^{k-r} \tag{6.10}$$

whenever $r \le \tilde{m}/2$, and where K_k is a constant depending only on k.

Proof: Let $\delta_i = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots)$ with 1 at the i-th position. Recall (see, e.g., [48, Equation 6.19]) that

$$\big| \mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}} \big| = \frac{\tilde{z}(\tilde{m} - 1)!}{\prod_{i \ge 0} \tilde{s}_i!}. \tag{6.11}$$

By exchangeability, it is enough to consider $X_1, \ldots, X_r$. Since there is a bijection between $\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}} - \delta_{i_1} - \delta_{i_2}}$ and the set of forests in $\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}}$ for which $X_1 = i_1$ and $X_2 = i_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i_1, X_2 = i_2 \big) = \frac{|\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}} - \delta_{i_1} - \delta_{i_2}}|}{|\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}}|}. \tag{6.12}$$

When $i_1 \neq i_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i_1, X_2 = i_2\big) = \frac{(\tilde{z}-2+i_1+i_2)\tilde{s}_{i_1}\tilde{s}_{i_2}}{\tilde{z}(\tilde{m}-1)(\tilde{m}-2)} \le 4\Big(1+\frac{i_1+i_2}{\tilde{z}}\Big)\frac{\tilde{s}_{i_1}\tilde{s}_{i_2}}{\tilde{m}^2}.$$

When $i_1 = i_2 = i$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i, X_2 = i\big) = \frac{(\tilde{z}-2+2i)\tilde{s}_i(\tilde{s}_i-1)}{\tilde{z}(\tilde{m}-1)(\tilde{m}-2)} \le 4\Big(1+\frac{2i}{\tilde{z}}\Big)\frac{\tilde{s}_i^2}{\tilde{m}^2}.$$

In general,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i_1, \dots, X_r = i_r\big) &\le 2^r\Big(1+\frac{i_1+\ldots+i_r}{\tilde{z}}\Big)\frac{\tilde{s}_{i_1}\times\ldots\times\tilde{s}_{i_r}}{\tilde{m}^r}\\ &\le r2^r\Big(1+\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{\tilde{z}}\Big)\frac{\tilde{s}_{i_1}\times\ldots\times\tilde{s}_{i_r}}{\tilde{m}^r}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i\ge1} i^{\sigma_j}\frac{\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}} \le \tilde{\Delta}^{(\sigma_j-2)\vee0}\sum_{i\ge1} i^2\frac{\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}} \le \tilde{\Delta}^{(\sigma_j-1)}\sum_{i\ge1} i^2\frac{\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}}.$$

Combining the above, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[X_1^{\sigma_1}\times\ldots\times X_r^{\sigma_r}\Big] \le r2^r\Big(1+\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{\tilde{z}}\Big)\Big(\sum_i \frac{i^2\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}}\Big)^r\tilde{\Delta}^{\sum_{j=1}^r(\sigma_j-1)},$$

which proves (6.9). The bound in (6.10) follows by a direct expansion. ■

From (5.2) and (5.3) it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})|}{s_0\sqrt{m}}\right)^k &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(U_m)\Big|\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}\Big)\Big]^k\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(U_m)^k}{m^{k/2}}\right) \le \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},U_m)|^k}{m^{k/2}}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{s}_1(\boldsymbol{t}) = (s_{1,i}(\boldsymbol{t}),\ i \ge 0)$ be the ECD corresponding to vertices in $[\rho, U_m]$ when $\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m) = \boldsymbol{t}$, i.e., $s_{1,i}(\boldsymbol{t})$ is the number of vertices in $[\rho, U_m]$ with i many children when $\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m) = \boldsymbol{t}$. Let

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t}) := \boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}_1(\boldsymbol{t}).$$

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be the (random) plane forest with ranked roots obtained by deleting the vertices of $[\rho, U_m]$ and the edges incident to them, rooting the resulting trees at the vertices in $\boldsymbol{B}_1(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$, and ranking the roots using the depth-first order. Note that there is a bijection between the realizations of $(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$ and of $\big(\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m), \mathscr{F}\big)$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{F} = \boldsymbol{f},\ \mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m) = \boldsymbol{t}\big) = \frac{1}{s_0|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|},\ \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t})}. \tag{6.14}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m) = \boldsymbol{t}\big) = \frac{|\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t})}|}{s_0|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|}.$$

Writing $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{t}} = (\cdot \mid \mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m) = \boldsymbol{t})$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\big(\mathscr{F} = \boldsymbol{f}\big) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t})}|}\ \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t})}. \tag{6.15}$$

Define the conditional expectation operator $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ in an analogous fashion. Let

$$E := \{\mathrm{ht}(U_m) < m/2\}.$$

By [2, Theorem 1],

$$\mathbb{P}(E^c) \le 7\exp(-cm). \tag{6.16}$$

Let $\tilde{z}, \tilde{m}, \tilde{\Delta}$ be as in Lemma 6.7 with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{t})$. Then $\tilde{m} \ge m/2$ on the event E, $\tilde{s}_i \le s_i$, and $\tilde{\Delta} \le \Delta$. Thus it follows from Lemma 6.7 that

$$\mathbb{1}_E \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left[|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)|^k\right] \le K\sum_{r=1}^{k}\left(\tilde{z}^r\Delta^{k-r} + \tilde{z}^{r-1}\Delta^{k-r+1}\right).$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_E|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)|^k\right] \le K\sum_{r=1}^{k}\left(\Delta^{k-r}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\boldsymbol{B}_1(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)\right|^r\right] + \Delta^{k-r+1}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\boldsymbol{B}_1(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)\right|^{r-1}\right]\right). \tag{6.17}$$

Let S^{exc} be as in (6.2). Letting

$$\boldsymbol{p} := (p_1, \ldots, p_m), \text{ where } p_i = \frac{c_i}{m-1},\ i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

an application of Lemma 6.5 shows that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{j} p_{\pi(i+i_0)} - \frac{j}{m}\Big| \ge x\sigma(\boldsymbol{p})\Big) \le \exp\big(-c_1 x\log\log x\big), \text{ for } x \ge c_2,$$

where i_0 has the same meaning as in (6.2). Since

$$\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{j}\frac{\big(c_{\pi(i+i_0)} - 1\big)}{m-1} - \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j} p_{\pi(i+i_0)} - \frac{j}{m}\Big)\Big| = \frac{j}{m(m-1)} \le \frac{1}{m-1},$$

we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{j\in[m]}\big|S^{\mathrm{exc}}(j)\big| \ge y\sqrt{m}\Big) \le \exp\big(-cy\log\log y\big),\ \ y \ge c'.$$

This implies that the same tail bound holds for $\boldsymbol{B}_1^-(U_m)$. Since $\boldsymbol{B}_1^+(U_m) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \boldsymbol{B}_1^-(U_m)$ and $\boldsymbol{B}_1 = \boldsymbol{B}_1^- + \boldsymbol{B}_1^+$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\big|\boldsymbol{B}_1(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)\big| \ge y\sqrt{m}\Big) \le \exp\big(-cy\log\log y\big),\ \ y \ge c'. \tag{6.18}$$

Combining (6.17) and (6.18), we conclude that

$$\sup_m \frac{1}{m^{k/2}}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_E|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)|^k\right] < \infty.$$

From (6.16), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{m^{k/2}}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_E^c|\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)|^k\right] \le 7m^{k/2}\exp(-cm).$$

We complete the proof of Lemma 6.3(ii) by combining these observations with (6.13). ■

6.3. **Proof of Lemma 6.3**(iii)**.** Note first that Lemma 6.3(ii) shows that $|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})|/m^{3/2}$ is tight. Now clearly

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big|^k - \big|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big| \\
&\quad = \#\Big\{\big((u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_k,v_k)\big) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})^k \;\Big|\; \{u_i,v_i\} \cap \{u_j,v_j\} \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } i \neq j\Big\} \\
&\quad \le k^2\big|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big|^{k-2}(R_{11}+2R_{12}+R_{22}),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

where

$$R_{11} = \#\Big\{\big((u_1,v_1),(u_2,v_2)\big) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})^2 \;\Big|\; u_1 = u_2\Big\},\ R_{12} = \#\Big\{\big((u_1,v_1),(u_2,v_2)\big) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})^2 \;\Big|\; u_1 = v_2\Big\},$$

and

$$R_{22} = \#\Big\{\big((u_1,v_1),(u_2,v_2)\big) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})^2 \;\Big|\; v_1 = v_2\Big\}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{11} &= \sum_{u \in \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})} \sum_{v_1 \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},u)} \#\Big\{v_2 \;\Big|\; (u,v_2) \in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\Big\} \\
&\le m \sum_{u \in \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})} f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}}(u) = m\big|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big| = mO_P(m^{3/2}) = o_P(m^3).
\end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that $R_{12}+R_{22} = o_P(m^3)$. Combined with (6.19), this gives

$$\big|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big|^k - \big|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}})\big| = O_P\big(m^{3(k-2)/2}\big)o_P(m^3) = o_P(m^{3k/2}),$$

as desired. ∎

6.4. **Proof of Lemma 6.3**(iv)**.** We will make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.8. *Let U_m be uniformly distributed on the s_0 leaves. Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{k \le \mathrm{ht}(U_m)} \left|\#\Big\{v \in \boldsymbol{A}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}}, U_m\big) \;\Big|\; \mathrm{ht}\big(\overleftarrow{v}\big) \le k\Big\} - \frac{p_0\sigma^2 k}{2}\right| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0.$$

We first prove Lemma 6.3(iv) assuming Lemma 6.8.

Completing the proof of Lemma 6.3(iv)**:** Theorem 6.2 shows that the shape of the subtree of $m^{-1/2}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ spanned by $(k+\ell)$ vertices sampled independently and uniformly from $[m]$ converges to the shape of $\sigma^{-1}\mathscr{T}_{k,\ell}$. By Lemma 6.3(i), the same conclusion holds if the first k vertices are sampled independently and uniformly from the s_0 leaves, and the other ℓ vertices are sampled independently and uniformly from $[m]$. Convergence of the root-to-leaf measures and the leaf values is a consequence of Lemma 6.8. ∎

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 6.8. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}_\kappa$ be a sequence of ECDs indexed by κ. We will suppress κ in the notation most of the time. Let $\tilde{m}$, $\tilde{\Delta}$, $\tilde{z}$ and $X_1,\dots,X_{\tilde{z}}$ be as in Lemma* 6.7*. Let $f : \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$. Assume that*

(i) $\tilde{z} \to \infty$*;*
(ii) *there exists $a > 0$ such that $\sum_{i\ge 0} f(i)\tilde{s}_i/\tilde{m} \to a$;*
(iii) $\sup_\kappa \sum_{i\ge 0} f^2(i)\tilde{s}_i/\tilde{m} < \infty$*;*
(iv) $\tilde{\Delta} = o(\tilde{z})$*; and*
(v) $\max_{1\le i\le\tilde{\Delta}} f(i) = o(\tilde{z})$.

Then

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{z}} \cdot \max_{1\le j\le \tilde{z}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^{j} f(X_i) - aj \Big| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0.$$

Proof: An argument similar to the one used in (6.12) gives

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i\big) = \frac{(\tilde{z}-1+i)\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{z}(\tilde{m}-1)}.$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{i\ge 1}^{\tilde{z}} \frac{f(X_i)}{\tilde{z}}\Big] = \mathbb{E}\big[f(X_1)\big] = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{\Delta}} \Big(\frac{(\tilde{z}-1+i)\tilde{m}}{\tilde{z}(\tilde{m}-1)}\Big)\frac{f(i)\tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{m}} \to a. \tag{6.20}$$

Similarly, using (6.12), a direct computation shows that $\mathrm{Cov}\big(f(X_1), f(X_2)\big) \to 0$, which in turn implies

$$\mathrm{Var}\Big[\sum_{i\ge 1}^{\tilde{z}} \frac{f(X_i)}{\tilde{z}}\Big] \to 0. \tag{6.21}$$

Combining (6.20) and (6.21), we see that

$$\sum_{i\ge 1}^{\tilde{z}} f(X_i)/\tilde{z} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} a. \tag{6.22}$$

Let $\hat{S} = (\hat{S}_0, \hat{S}_1, \ldots)$ denote the empirical distribution of $X_1, \ldots, X_{\tilde{z}}$. Since

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i_1, \ldots, X_{\tilde{z}} = i_{\tilde{z}}\big) = \frac{|\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{s}-\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}}|}{|\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|}$$

for any $(i_1, \ldots, i_{\tilde{z}})$ with empirical distribution $\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_1 = i_1, \ldots, X_{\tilde{z}} = i_{\tilde{z}} \;\big|\; \hat{S} = \hat{\mathbf{s}}\big) = \frac{\prod_{i\ge 0} \hat{s}_i!}{\tilde{z}!} \tag{6.23}$$

Define $y_1, \ldots, y_{\tilde{z}}$ as follows:

$$y_1 = \ldots = y_{\hat{S}_0} = 0, \;\; y_{\hat{S}_0+1} = \ldots = y_{\hat{S}_0+\hat{S}_1} = 1, \ldots.$$

Then conditional on $\hat{S}$, the distribution (6.23) can be generated by uniformly permuting $y_1, \ldots, y_{\tilde{z}}$ and removing the y labels. Set

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{p}} := (\hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{p}_{\tilde{z}}), \;\text{ where }\; \hat{p}_i = \frac{f(y_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{z}} f(y_j)}.$$

From Lemma 6.5, for a uniform permutation π (independent of $\hat{S}$) on $\tilde{z}$ elements and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{1\le j\le \tilde{z}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^{j} \hat{p}_{\pi(i)} - \frac{j}{\tilde{z}}\Big| \ge \varepsilon \;\Big|\; \hat{S}\Big) \le \exp\Big(-c_1\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})}\Big)\log\log\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})}\Big)\Big) \;\text{ on }\; \big\{c_2\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}) \le \varepsilon\big\}. \tag{6.24}$$

Since

$$\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})^2 \le \hat{p}_{\max} = \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sum_{1\le i\le \tilde{z}} f(X_i)} \times \max_{1\le i\le \tilde{\Delta}} \frac{f(i)}{\tilde{z}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0,$$

we conclude from (6.24) that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{1\le j\le \tilde{z}} \Big| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j} f(X_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{z}} f(X_k)} - \frac{j}{\tilde{z}}\Big| \ge \varepsilon\Big) \to 0,$$

which combined with (6.22) yields the claim. ■

Proof of Lemma 6.8: It follows from [18, Proposition 5] that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{k\le \mathrm{ht}(U_m)} \Big| \#\Big\{ v \;\Big|\; v\in \boldsymbol{B}_1^-(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m),\ \mathrm{ht}\big(\overleftarrow{v}\big)\le k\Big\} - \frac{\sigma^2 k}{2}\Big| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0, \tag{6.25}$$

and a similar statement is true with $\boldsymbol{B}_1^+$ by symmetry. Now recall from (6.15) that conditional on $\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$, the forest $\mathscr{F}$ (defined around (6.14)) is uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{F}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}}$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}$ is the ECD of the vertices in $[\rho, U_m]^c$. We make the following observations about the forest $\mathscr{F}$:

(i) The ECD $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}$ of $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies

$$s_i - \mathrm{ht}(U_m) \le \tilde{s}_i \le s_i,$$

where $\mathrm{ht}(U_m) = \Theta_P(\sqrt{m})$ by Theorem 6.2.

(ii) Similarly, the number of vertices $\tilde{m}$ (say) in $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies

$$m - \mathrm{ht}(U_m) \le \tilde{m} \le m.$$

(iii) (6.25) and its analogue for $\boldsymbol{B}_1^+$ combined with the fact $\mathrm{ht}(U_m) = \Theta_P(\sqrt{m})$ shows that the number of roots of $\mathscr{F}$, namely $|\boldsymbol{B}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)|$ satisfies

$$|\boldsymbol{B}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)| = \Theta_P(\sqrt{m}).$$

Thus, when $\boldsymbol{s}$ satisfies Assumption 6.1, the ECD of $\mathscr{F}$ and the function $f(i) = i$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 6.9 with $a = 1$. This combined with (6.25) gives

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{k\le \mathrm{ht}(U_m)} \Big| \#\Big\{ v \;\Big|\; \overleftarrow{v}\in \boldsymbol{B}_1^-(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m),\ \mathrm{ht}\big(\overleftarrow{\overleftarrow{v}}\big)\le k\Big\} - \frac{\sigma^2 k}{2}\Big| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0, \tag{6.26}$$

and a similar statement is true with $\boldsymbol{B}_1^+$.

Let $\mathscr{F}^{(2)}$ be the plane forest with ranked roots obtained by deleting the vertices of $\mathrm{Anc}^{(1)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$ and the edges incident to them, rooting the resulting trees at the vertices of $\boldsymbol{B}_2(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$, and ranking them in the depth-first order. Then conditional on $\mathrm{Anc}^{(2)}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, U_m)$, $\mathscr{F}^{(2)}$ is again uniformly distributed over the set of plane forests with ranked roots with the remaining children sequence. Further, reasoning similar to above shows that the ECD of $\mathscr{F}^{(2)}$ and the function $f(i) = \mathbb{1}\{i = 0\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 6.9 with $a = p_0$.

Applying Lemma 6.9 to the forest $\mathscr{F}^{(2)}$ and the function $f(i) = \mathbb{1}\{i = 0\}$, and combining this with (6.26) yields the claim in Lemma 6.8. ■

6.5. **Proof of Lemma 6.3**(v)**.** First recall from Lemma 6.3 (i) that $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathscr{L}}$ denoted the metric measure space obtained when the underlying tree is endowed with the uniform probability measure on $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})$. Let $U_m^{(i)}$, $1 \le i \le k$, and $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be as in Lemma 6.3(iv). Lemma 6.3(i) together with Theorem 6.2 shows that for all $k \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathscr{L}},\ \frac{1}{k\sqrt{m}}\Big(\mathrm{ht}(U_m^{(1)}) + \ldots + \mathrm{ht}(U_m^{(k)})\Big)\Big)\\ \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}},\ \frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}},\ \frac{1}{k\sigma}\Big(\mathrm{ht}(x_1) + \ldots + \mathrm{ht}(x_k)\Big)\Big)\end{aligned}$$

with respect to product topology induced by GHP topology on the first two coordinates and Euclidean topology on $\mathbb{R}$ on the third coordinate. Thus by Lemma 6.8,

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\ \frac{1}{k\sqrt{m}}\Big(f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})+\ldots+f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(k)})\Big)\Big)\xrightarrow{\text{w}}\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}},\ \frac{p_0\sigma}{2k}\Big(\text{ht}(x_1)+\ldots+\text{ht}(x_k)\Big)\Big). \tag{6.27}$$

Now for any $\varepsilon>0$ and $k\geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{k\sqrt{m}}\Big(f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})+\ldots+f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(k)})\Big)-\frac{|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})|}{s_0\sqrt{m}}\Big|\geq\varepsilon\Big)\\
&\quad=\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{k\sqrt{m}}\Big(f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})+\ldots+f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(k)})\Big)-\frac{\mathbb{E}\big(f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})\big|\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big)}{\sqrt{m}}\Big|\geq\varepsilon\Big)\\
&\quad\leq\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2km}\mathbb{E}\Big[\text{Var}\Big(f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})\big|\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\Big)\Big]\leq\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2km}\mathbb{E}\Big[f_{\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(1)})^2\Big]\leq\frac{C}{\varepsilon^2k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because of (5.2) and the last step uses Lemma 6.3(ii). By a similar argument, we can show that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{k}\big(\text{ht}(x_1)+\ldots+\text{ht}(x_k)\big)-\int_{\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}\text{ht}(x)\mu_{\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}(dx)\Big|\geq\varepsilon\Big)\leq\frac{C}{\varepsilon^2k}.$$

These observations combined with (6.27) yield

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\frac{|\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})|}{s_0\sqrt{m}}\Big)\xrightarrow{\text{w}}\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}},\frac{p_0\sigma}{2}\int_{\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}\text{ht}(x)\ \mu_{\mathcal{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}(dx)\Big),$$

which is the desired result. ■

7. Asymptotics for connected graphs with given degree sequence

The aim of this section is to prove Theorems 2.6 and 2.7. We will start with a construction of the uniform measure on the space of simple connected graphs with a prescribed degree sequence with some fixed number k of surplus edges (Lemma 7.1). Using this lemma together with the technical lemma 6.3, we will then complete the proofs of the above two theorems.

7.1. **Construction of connected graphs with given degree sequence.** Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}=\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\widetilde{m})}$ be as in Theorem 2.6, and recall that $\mathcal{G}^{\text{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}$ represents a random connected graph with degree sequence $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}$ sampled uniformly from $\mathbb{G}^{\text{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}$. Recall also that under Assumption 2.5, $\widetilde{d}_1=1$. Consider the remaining vertices $\{2,\ldots,\widetilde{m}\}$, and form the children sequence $\boldsymbol{c}=(c_j:2\leq j\leq(\widetilde{m}+2k))$ via

$$\boldsymbol{c}:=\big(\widetilde{d}_2-1,\ldots,\widetilde{d}_{\widetilde{m}}-1,0,\ldots,0\big)\quad\text{(with }2k\text{ zeros at the end).} \tag{7.1}$$

By the hypothesis of Theorem 2.6,

$$\sum_{j=2}^{\widetilde{m}+2k}c_j=(\widetilde{m}-1+2k)-1, \tag{7.2}$$

and thus $\boldsymbol{c}$ represents a valid children sequence for a tree on

$$m:=\widetilde{m}-1+2k \tag{7.3}$$

vertices. Let $\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}=(s_0,s_1,\ldots)$ be the empirical distribution of $\boldsymbol{c}$, i.e.,

$$s_i=\#\big\{j\ :\ c_j=i\big\}. \tag{7.4}$$

Sample $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$ from $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}$ uniformly. Assume that $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{(u_1, v_1), \ldots, (u_k, v_k)\}$, where

$$(u_1, v_1) \ll \ldots \ll (u_k, v_k).$$

Label u_j as $\tilde{m}+2j-1$ and v_j as $\tilde{m}+2j$, $1 \le j \le k$. Label the other $\tilde{m}-1$ vertices of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ uniformly using labels $2, \ldots, \tilde{m}$ so that in the resulting labeled plane tree j has $\tilde{d}_j - 1$ many children. (Thus there are $(s_0 - 2k)! \times \prod_{i \ge 1} s_i!$ many ways of obtaining such a labeling of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$). Call this labeled, plane tree $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathrm{lab}}$. Construct the graph $\mathscr{I}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathrm{lab}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$, attach a vertex labeled 1 to the root, and then forget about the planar order and the root. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the resulting graph.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the random graph resulting from the above construction. Then $\mathcal{G} \sim$ Unif$(\mathbb{G}_{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}}^{\mathrm{con}})$, i.e., $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}}^{\mathrm{con}}$.*

Proof: Fix a graph $G \in \mathbb{G}_{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}}^{\mathrm{con}}$. Root the graph at the only neighbor of 1 (recall that $\tilde{d}_1 = 1$), and remove the vertex 1 and the edge incident to it. Suppose H is the resulting rooted, labeled graph. We can construct a labeled plane tree from H in the following way:

(i) Call the root u_1. Set the status of all its neighbors as "discovered," and set the status of u_1 as "explored." Shuffle all its neighbors uniformly and go to the "leftmost" neighbor and call it u_2.

(ii) When we are at u_k ($k \ge 2$), search for all its neighbors (other than u_{k-1}) in the graph at that time. If none of these neighbors have been discovered previously, then shuffle them uniformly, set their status as "discovered," set the status of u_k as "explored," and go to the leftmost neighbor and call it u_{k+1}.

If some of these neighbors have been previously discovered, then these edges create surplus. Suppose we have found ℓ_0 many surplus edges before exploring u_k, and at u_k we found ℓ_1 many new surplus edges $e_1, \ldots, e_{\ell_1}$. Assume that $e_j = (u_k, y_j)$ and $y_1 \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} \ldots \prec_{\mathrm{DF}} y_{\ell_1}$. For $j = 1, \ldots, \ell_1$, delete the edge e_j, and create two leaves labeled $\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j - 1$ and $\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j$, where $u_k = \overleftarrow{\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j - 1}$ (i.e., u_k is the **parent** of leaf labeled $\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j - 1$) and similarly $y_j = \overleftarrow{\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j}$. Shuffle the neighbors of u_k uniformly (including the newly created leaves), set their status as "discovered," set the status of u_k as "explored," and move to the leftmost neighbor and call it u_{k+1}. (Note that we do **not** set the status of $\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell_1$ as discovered.)

If u_k has no neighbors other than u_{k-1}, then go to the next (in the depth-first order) discovered but unexplored vertex and call it u_{k+1}.

Let $\boldsymbol{t}^{\mathrm{lab}}$ be the resulting labeled plane tree and set $\boldsymbol{x} = \{(\tilde{m}+1, \tilde{m}+2), \ldots, (\tilde{m}+2k-1, \tilde{m}+2k)\}$. Note that $(\tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j - 1, \tilde{m} + 2\ell_0 + 2j)$ is an admissible pair for $1 \le j \le k$. Note also that the children sequence of $\boldsymbol{t}^{\mathrm{lab}}$ is always $\boldsymbol{c}$ defined in (7.1). Thus $(\boldsymbol{t}^{\mathrm{lab}}, \boldsymbol{x})$ is a (labeled) element of $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}$. Let DF$(H)$ be the set of all labeled elements of $\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}$ one can obtain in this way. Then

$$\big|\mathrm{DF}(H)\big| = \prod_{j=2}^{\tilde{m}} (\tilde{d}_j - 1)!.$$

Now

$$\mathbb{P}\big((\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathrm{lab}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}) = (\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{x})\big) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}|} \times \frac{1}{(s_0 - 2k)! \times \prod_{i \ge 1} s_i!} \text{ for every } (\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathrm{DF}(H).$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{I}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathrm{lab}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})=H\big)=\sum_{(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x})\in \mathrm{DF}(H)}\mathbb{P}\big((\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{\mathrm{lab}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})=(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x})\big)$$
$$=\frac{\prod_{j=2}^{\tilde{m}}(\tilde{d}_j-1)!}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}|}\times\frac{1}{(s_0-2k)!\times\prod_{i\geq 1}s_i!}. \tag{7.5}$$

Since this probability is constant and the map from G to H is a bijection, we get the desired result. ■

7.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.6.** Let $\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}$ be as in (7.4). Note that when $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}^{(\tilde{m})}$ satisfies Assumption 2.5, $\boldsymbol{s}^{(m)}$ satisfies Assumption 6.1 with limiting p.m.f. $(p_i:i\geq 0)$, where

$$p_i:=\tilde{p}_{i+1},\ \ i=0,1,\ldots.$$

In view of Lemma 7.1, it is enough to prove the result for $\tilde{m}^{-1/2}\mathscr{I}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$. Recall the definition of $\mathscr{Q}(\cdot,\cdot)$ from Section 5.1. Then

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}\mathscr{I}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}),\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}\mathscr{Q}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})\Big)\leq\frac{5k}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}.$$

Thus it is enough to prove the the result for the space $m^{-1/2}\mathscr{Q}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$ (recall the definition of m from (7.3)).

Recall the various notions of weak convergence on the space of metric measure spaces defined in Section 3.1. We will first prove convergence of $m^{-1/2}\mathscr{Q}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$ in the Gromov-weak topology by making use of a technique from [13] and then strengthen it to convergence in the GHP sense. Let Φ and ϕ be as in (3.6). Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)\Big)\right)=\frac{\sum_{(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x})\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}|}$$
$$=\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)\Big/\big(|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}\big)}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}|\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})|\big/\big(|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}\big)}$$
$$=\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)\Big/\big(|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}\big)}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})|\big/\big(|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}\big)}. \tag{7.6}$$

Next,

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}}=\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)\frac{1}{s_0^k m^{k/2}}\Big] \tag{7.7}$$
$$=\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})^k}\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)\frac{1}{s_0^k m^{k/2}}\Big]+o(1),$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 6.3 (ii) and (iii). Writing

$$\boldsymbol{x}=\big((u_1,y_1),\ldots,(u_k,y_k)\big),\ \sum\nolimits_1=\sum_{\substack{u_1\in\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})\\ \vdots\\ u_k\in\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})}},\ \text{and}\ \sum\nolimits_2=\sum_{\substack{y_1\in\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},u_1)\\ \vdots\\ y_k\in\boldsymbol{A}(\mathcal{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},u_k)}},$$

we note that

$$\frac{1}{s_0^k m^{k/2}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{A}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})^k} \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big) = \frac{1}{s_0^k m^{k/2}} \sum\nolimits_1 \sum\nolimits_2 \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big) \tag{7.8}$$

$$= \sum\nolimits_1 \Big(\frac{1}{s_0^k}\Big) \prod_{i=1}^k \Big(\frac{f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(u_i)}{\sqrt{m}}\Big) \sum\nolimits_2 \prod_{i=1}^k \Big(\frac{1}{f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(u_i)}\Big) \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{U} = (U_m^{(i)} : 1 \le i \le k)$, $\boldsymbol{V} = (V_m^{(j)} : 1 \le j \le \ell)$, and $\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{U},\boldsymbol{V})$ be as in Lemma 6.3(iv). We now recall some constructs from [13]. Recall the space $\mathbf{T}_J^*$ from Section 3.4. Let $\mathbf{t}$ be an element in $\mathbf{T}_{k+\ell}^*$. Denote its root by ρ and its leaves by

$$\mathbf{z}_{k,k+\ell} := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k, z_{k+1}, \dots, z_{k+\ell}). \tag{7.9}$$

Also recall that for each i, there is a probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{t},i}(\cdot)$ on the path $[\rho, z_i]$ for $1 \le i \le k+\ell$. For $1 \le i \le k$, sample y_i according to the distribution $\nu_{\mathbf{t},i}(\cdot)$ independently for different i and identify z_i with y_i. Let $\mathbf{t}'$ denote the (random) space thus obtained, and let $d_{\mathbf{t}'}$ denote the induced metric on $\mathbf{t}'$. Define the function $g_\phi^{(k)} : \mathbf{T}_{k+\ell}^* \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_\phi^{(k)}(\mathbf{t}) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\big[\phi\big(d_{\mathbf{t}'}(z_i,z_j) : k+1 \le i \le k+\ell\big)\big], \text{ if } \mathbf{t} \ne \partial, \\ 0, \text{ if } \mathbf{t} = \partial. \end{cases} \tag{7.10}$$

In words, we look at the expectation of ϕ applied to the pairwise distances between the last ℓ leaves after sampling y_i on the path $[\rho, z_i]$ for $1 \le i \le k$ and identifying z_i with y_i. Note that here the expectation is only taken over the choices of y_i.

Write $d_{\mathscr{Q}}$ for the induced metric on the space $m^{-1/2}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)$, and let $\sum_3 = \sum_{v_1,\dots,v_\ell \in [m]}$. Then

$$\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big) = \sum\nolimits_3 \frac{1}{m^\ell}\phi\Big(d_{\mathscr{Q}}(v_i,v_j) : 1 \le i < j \le \ell\Big).$$

Writing $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ and $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$, we immediately see that

$$\Big|\sum\nolimits_2 \prod_{i=1}^k \Big(\frac{1}{f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(u_i)}\Big) \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big) - \sum\nolimits_3 \frac{1}{m^\ell} g_\phi^{(k)}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})\Big)\Big| \le \|\phi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{V}) = \partial \big|\, \mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{U},\boldsymbol{V}) = \partial\big) \to 0$ (by Lemma 6.3(iv)), and $\prod_{i=1}^k \big(f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(i)})/\sqrt{m}\big)$ is uniformly integrable (by Lemma 6.3(ii)), combining the last display with (7.7) and (7.8),

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})} \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}| \cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{i=1}^k \Big(\frac{f_{\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}(U_m^{(i)})}{\sqrt{m}}\Big) g_\phi^{(k)}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{U},\boldsymbol{V})\Big)\Big] + o(1). \tag{7.11}$$

Since the functional $g_\phi^{(k)}$ is continuous on the space $\mathbf{T}_{k+\ell}^*$ [13, Proposition 4.25], combining (7.11) with Lemma 6.3(iv) and using uniform integrability (Lemma 6.3(ii)), we get

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})} \Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big)}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}| \cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}} \tag{7.12}$$

$$\to \Big(\frac{p_0\sigma}{2}\Big)^k \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{x_1\in\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}} \dots \int_{x_{k+\ell}\in\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}} \mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}^{\otimes k+\ell}(dx_1 \dots dx_{k+\ell}) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathrm{ht}(x_i) \cdot g_\phi^{(k)}\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{k,\ell}\Big)\Big].$$

Taking $\Phi \equiv 1$ in (7.12), we get

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} |\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})|}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|\cdot s_0^k m^{k/2}} \to \Big(\frac{p_0\sigma}{2}\Big)^k \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}} \mathrm{ht}(x)\,\mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}(dx)\Big)^k\Big]. \tag{7.13}$$

Combining the above, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)\Big)\Big] &\to \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{x_1}\ldots\int_{x_{k+\ell}} \mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}^{\otimes k+\ell}(dx_1\ldots dx_{k+\ell})\prod_{i=1}^k \mathrm{ht}(x_i)\cdot g_\phi^{(k)}\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{k,\ell}\Big)\Big]}{\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}\mathrm{ht}(x)\,\mu_{\mathscr{T}_{2\mathbf{e}}}(dx)\Big)^k\Big]},\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Phi\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}M^{(k)}\Big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \frac{1}{\sigma}M^{(k)} \tag{7.14}$$

in the Gromov-weak sense.

We now want to lift it to GHP convergence. To this end, for any metric measure space (X,d,μ) and $\delta>0$, define

$$\kappa_\delta(X) = \kappa_\delta(X,d,\mu) := \inf_{x\in X}\Big\{\mu\big\{y\,:\,d(y,x)\le\delta\big\}\Big\}.$$

From the definition of $(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$ (given right below (7.2)), it is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}=\boldsymbol{t}\big) = \frac{|\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})|}{|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}^{(k)}|} = \frac{|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t})|}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}'\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}}|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\boldsymbol{t}')|}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}$. Hence for any bounded continuous (w.r.t. GHP topology) h,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[h\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\Big)\Big] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big[h\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\Big)\cdot\big|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})\big|s_0^{-k}m^{-k/2}\Big]}{\mathbb{E}\big[|\boldsymbol{A}_k^{\mathrm{ord}}(\mathscr{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}})|s_0^{-k}m^{-k/2}\big]}.$$

Using Lemma 6.3(iii), and Lemma 6.3(v) together with uniform integrability (6.3(ii)), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[h\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\Big)\Big] \to \mathbb{E}\Big[h\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma}\mathscr{T}_{2\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}}\Big)\Big],$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}$ is as defined before (3.12). Hence $m^{-1/2}\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \sigma^{-1}\mathscr{T}_{2\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_{(k)}}$ in the GHP sense, and in particular, for each $\delta>0$, $1/\kappa_\delta\big(m^{-1/2}\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big)$, $m\ge1$ is a tight sequence of random variables. This immediately implies that $1/\kappa_\delta\big(m^{-1/2}\mathscr{Q}(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})\big)$, $m\ge1$ is also a tight sequence of random variables for each $\delta>0$. Combining this with (7.14) and [9, Theorem 6.1], we see that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\mathscr{Q}\big(\widetilde{\mathscr{T}}_{\boldsymbol{s}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}} \frac{1}{\sigma}M^{(k)}$$

in the GHP sense. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.6. ∎

7.3. **Proof of Theorem 2.7.** Recall the relation between m and $\widetilde{m}$ from (7.3). Now it follows from (7.5) that

$$\big|\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}\big| = \frac{\big|\mathbb{T}^{(k)}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big| \times (s_0-2k)! \times \prod_{i\geq 1} s_i!}{\prod_{j=1}^{\widetilde{m}} (\widetilde{d}_j - 1)!}.$$

Further,

$$\big|\mathbb{T}^{(k)}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} |\boldsymbol{A}_k(\boldsymbol{t})| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} |\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{ord}}_k(\boldsymbol{t})|/k!.$$

It thus follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{con}}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}}\big| &= \frac{s_0^k m^{k/2} \times \big|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big| \times (s_0-2k)! \times \prod_{i\geq 1} s_i!}{\prod_{j=1}^{\widetilde{m}} (\widetilde{d}_j-1)! \times k!} \times \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}} \frac{|\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{ord}}_k(\boldsymbol{t})|}{\big|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}\big| s_0^k m^{k/2}} \\ &\sim \frac{s_0^k m^{k/2} \times (\widetilde{m}+2k-2)! \times (s_0-2k)!}{s_0! \times \prod_{j=1}^{\widetilde{m}} (\widetilde{d}_j-1)! \times k!} \times \Big(\frac{p_0\sigma}{2}\Big)^k \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^1 2\mathbf{e}(x)dx\Big)^k\Big],\end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses (7.13) and the expression for $|\mathbb{T}_{\boldsymbol{s}}|$ from (6.11). Using the relations $m/\widetilde{m} \sim 1$ and $s_0!/(s_0-2k)! \sim s_0^k (mp_0)^k$, a simple rearrangement of terms completes the proof. ■

8. Proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.4

We start with the distribution of the configuration model.

Lemma 8.1 ([32], Proposition 7.7)**.** *Let G be a multigraph on vertex set $[n]$ in which there are x_{ij} many edges between i and j, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, and vertex i has x_{ii} many loops. Let $\overline{d}_i = x_{ii} + \sum_{j=1}^n x_{ij}$ be the total degree of i (note that a loop contributes two to the degree). Let*

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}} = (\overline{d}_1, \ldots, \overline{d}_n), \text{ and } \ell_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{d}_i.$$

Then

$$\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,\overline{\mathbf{d}}}(G) = \frac{1}{(\ell_n-1)!!} \times \frac{\prod_{i\in[n]} \overline{d}_i!}{\prod_{i\in[n]} 2^{x_{ii}} \prod_{1\leq i\leq j\leq n} x_{ij}!}.$$

We now state two fundamental results about the configuration model and uniform simple graphs with prescribed degree.

(a) From Lemma 8.1 (see also [16, 43]), it follows that conditional on being simple, the configuration model has the same distribution as $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}) \in \cdot \,\big|\, \mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}\big) := \mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}} \in \cdot\big). \tag{8.1}$$

(b) By [36, Theorem 1.1], under Assumption 2.3, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the probability that $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ is simple satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}\big) \to c, \qquad \text{as } n\to\infty. \tag{8.2}$$

This connection between $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ and $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ is a very useful tool as it enables one to prove certain results about the uniform simple graph with given degrees by first obtaining a similar result for the configuration model, and then using (8.1) and (8.2) to deduce the same for the simple graph.

For any nonnegative random variable X with $\mathbb{E}X > 0$, define the corresponding size biased random variable X° with distribution given by

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X^\circ \le x\big) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\big[X\mathbb{1}_{X\le x}\big]}{\mathbb{E}\big[X\big]},\ \ x \in [0,\infty).$$

Proposition 8.2. *Assume that* **d** *satisfies Assumption* 2.3 *with limiting random variable D, and let D° denote the corresponding size-biased random variable. Let*

$$p_i^\circ := \mathbb{P}\big(D^\circ = i\big) = \frac{i\mathbb{P}\big(D=i\big)}{\mathbb{E}\big[D\big]},\ \ i = 1,2,\ldots.$$

(i) *Let $\mathscr{C}_{(k)}$ be the k-th largest component of* $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$. *Then the following hold for each $k \ge 1$:*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathscr{C}_{(k)}|}\sum_{v\in\mathscr{C}_{(k)}} d_v^2 \xrightarrow{\ \mathrm{P}\ } \sum_{i\ge 1} i^2 p_i^\circ < \infty; \tag{8.3}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathscr{C}_{(k)} \text{ is simple}\right) \to 1; \tag{8.4}$$

$$\frac{1}{|\mathscr{C}_{(k)}|}\#\big\{v\in\mathscr{C}_{(k)} : d_v = i\big\} \xrightarrow{\ \mathrm{P}\ } p_i^\circ \ \text{ for } \ i \ge 1. \tag{8.5}$$

(ii) *Further* (8.3) *and* (8.5) *continue to hold if we replace* $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ *by* $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$.

Proof: Given a sequence $a_1,\ldots,a_\ell$ of positive real numbers, the (random) size-biased permutation $\pi(1),\ldots,\pi(\ell)$ can be obtained as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\pi(1)=i\big) = \frac{a_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j},\ \text{ and }\ \mathbb{P}\big(\pi(k)=i \,\big|\, \mathscr{S}_{k-1}\big) = \frac{a_i}{\sum_{j\notin\mathscr{S}_{k-1}} a_j},\ \ k=2,\ldots,\ell,$$

where $\mathscr{S}_k = \{\pi(1),\ldots,\pi(k)\}$. It is a standard fact that the random graph $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ can be explored in a depth-first way so that the vertices appear as a size-biased permutation, where vertex i has size d_i; see [25, Section 5.1] or [49]. It further follows from [25, Lemma 15] and Theorem 3.2 that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $T_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_n\ \mathbb{P}\big(\mathscr{C}_{(k)} \text{ is explored by time } T_\varepsilon n^{2/3}\big) \ge 1-\varepsilon. \tag{8.6}$$

[25, Lemma 5] shows that for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{0\le u\le T}\Big|\frac{1}{n^{2/3}}\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor un^{2/3}\rfloor} d_{\pi(i)}^2 - \frac{\sigma_3 u}{\sigma_1}\Big| \xrightarrow{\ \mathrm{P}\ } 0, \tag{8.7}$$

where $\sigma_r = \mathbb{E}[D^r]$, $r = 1,2,3$. Combining (8.6) and (8.7), we get

$$\frac{1}{n^{2/3}}\Big(\sum_{v\in\mathscr{C}_{(k)}} d_v^2 - \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_1}\big|\mathscr{C}_{(k)}\big|\Big) \xrightarrow{\ \mathrm{P}\ } 0.$$

Since $\sigma_3/\sigma_1 = \mathbb{E}\big[D^{\circ 2}\big] = \sum_{i\ge1} i^2 p_i^\circ$, the last display together with Theorem 3.2 yields (8.3).

(8.4) follows from [25, Section 5.3] or by following verbatim the proof of this exact result but under slightly different moment assumptions in [24, Equation 7.6]. (8.5) follows from [25, Equation 6.4].

Finally, part (ii) follows from (i) by an application of (8.1) and (8.2). ■

Proof of Theorem 2.4(i). Note that $\mathbb{P}\big(D=1\big)>0$ under Assumption 2.3. Hence $p_1^\circ>0$. Further, under Assumption 2.3,

$$\sum_{i\geq 1} i\, p_i^\circ = \mathbb{E}\left[D^\circ\right] = \mathbb{E}D^2/\mathbb{E}D = 2.$$

Hence, by Proposition 8.2 (ii), for every $k\geq 1$, $(d_v\ :\ v\in\mathscr{C}_{(k)})$ satisfies Assumption 2.5 (after a possible relabeling of vertices) with limiting p.m.f. $(p_1^\circ,p_2^\circ,\ldots)$.

Let $\mathscr{P}$ denote the partition of $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathbf{d}}$ into different components. Then conditional on $\mathscr{P}$, each component is uniformly distributed over the set of simple, connected graphs with the degrees prescribed by the partition $\mathscr{P}$. Further, different components are conditionally independent. We thus conclude using Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 2.6 that for every $k\geq 1$,

$$n^{-2/3}\big(|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}|,\ldots,|\mathscr{C}_{(k)}|\big)\xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}}\big(|\gamma_{(1)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda)|,\ldots,|\gamma_{(k)}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_D}(\lambda)|\big)$$

jointly with

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathscr{C}_{(1)}|}}\mathscr{C}_{(1)},\ldots,\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathscr{C}_{(k)}|}}\mathscr{C}_{(k)}\Big)\xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}}\frac{\alpha_D}{\sqrt{\eta_D}}\big(S_1,\ldots,S_k\big)$$

in the GHP sense, where S_i are as in Construction 3.5, and η_D, and α_D are as in Theorem 3.2. (Here we have used the fact $\sum_{i\geq 1} i^2 p_i^\circ - 4 = \eta_D/\alpha_D^2$.) Combining the two yields the result. ■

Proof of Theorem 2.4(ii). By Proposition 8.2 (i), for every $k\geq 1$, $(d_v\ :\ v\in\mathscr{C}_{(k)})$ satisfies Assumption 2.5 (after a possible relabeling of vertices) with limiting p.m.f. $(p_1^\circ,p_2^\circ,\ldots)$. As before, let $\mathscr{P}$ denote the partition of $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d})$ into different components. For each $k\geq 1$, define the event

$$E_k := \big\{\mathscr{C}_{(j)}\ \text{is simple for all}\ 1\leq j\leq k\big\}.$$

Then note that by Lemma 8.1, conditional on the event $E_k\cap\{\mathscr{P}=P\}$, $\mathscr{C}_{(j)}$, $j\geq 1$ are independent, and for each $i\leq k$, $\mathscr{C}_{(i)}$ is uniformly distributed over the set of simple, connected graphs with the degrees prescribed by the partition P. Since $\mathbb{P}(E_k^c)\to 0$ by (8.4), the result follows by imitating the argument used in the proof of Theorem 2.4(i). ■

Proof of Theorem 2.1(ii). For every $u\geq 0$, let $\mathcal{V}^u$ denote the vacant set left by a random walk on $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)})$ run up to time nu. Let $\mathcal{E}^u$ be the set of all edges of $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)})$ both of whose endpoints are in $\mathcal{V}^u$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}^u := \big\{\{v_1,v_2\}\in\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)}):\ v_1,v_2\in\mathcal{V}^u\big\}.$$

Define the vacant graph $\boldsymbol{V}^u$ by $\boldsymbol{V}^u := ([n],\mathcal{E}^u)$, and let $\mathbf{D}^u := \big(\mathbf{D}^u(j)\ :\ j\in[n]\big)$ be the degree sequence of $\boldsymbol{V}^u$. Then, by [20, Proposition 3.1], for any collection A of multigraphs on $[n]$,

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}\big(\boldsymbol{V}^u\in A\big) = \sum_{\mathbf{d}}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}\big(\mathbf{D}^u=\mathbf{d}\big)\times\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{n,\mathbf{d}}\big(A\big). \tag{8.8}$$

In words, the vacant graph $\boldsymbol{V}^u$ can be generated in two steps: (i) sample the degree sequence $\mathbf{D}^u$ under the annealed measure $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}$, and then (ii) construct a configuration model with this degree sequence.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}^u=\big(s_0^u,\ldots,s_r^u\big)$ denote the empirical distribution of $\mathbf{D}^u$. Then, by [20, Equation 6.1], for every $\varepsilon>0$,

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}s_i^{u_\star}-\mathbb{P}\left(D_{\mathrm{vac}}=i\right)\Big|\geq\varepsilon\Big)\to 0,\ \ 0\leq i\leq r,$$

where $u_\star$ is as in (2.1), and $D_{\rm vac}$ is as in (3.14). The simple observation

$$\left|s_i^{u_\star} - s_i^{u_n}\right| \le (|a_0|+1)n^{2/3}(r+1)$$

for large n when u_n satisfies (2.3) leads to

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}s_i^{u_n} - \mathbb{P}\left(D_{\rm vac} = i\right)\Big| \ge \varepsilon\Big) \to 0, \;\; 0 \le i \le r. \tag{8.9}$$

Further, by [20, Equation 6.4],

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{n,r}\Big(n^{1/3}\Big|\frac{\sum_{i=0}^r (i^2-2i)s_i^{u_n}}{\sum_{i=0}^r i s_i^{u_n}} - \lambda_{\rm vac}\Big| \ge \varepsilon\Big) \to 0, \tag{8.10}$$

where $\lambda_{\rm vac}$ is as in (3.13). Combining (8.9) and (8.10), we see that the degree sequence $\mathbf{D}^{u_n}$ satisfies Assumption 2.3 with limiting random variable $D_{\rm vac}$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{\rm vac}$. In view of (8.8), an application of Theorem 2.4(ii) completes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 2.1(i). Let $\boldsymbol{V}^u$, $\mathbf{D}^u$, and $\boldsymbol{s}^u$ be as in the proof of Theorem 2.1(ii), but with $\mathscr{G}_{n,r}$ as the underlying graph (instead of $\mathrm{CM}_n(\mathbf{d}_r^{(n)})$). By [23, Lemma 7], the analogue of (8.8) is true in this case, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,r}\left(\boldsymbol{V}^u \in A\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{d}} \mathbf{P}_{n,r}\left(\mathbf{D}^u = \mathbf{d}\right) \times \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathbf{d}}\left(A\right),$$

for any collection A of simple graphs on $[n]$. Further, using (8.1) and (8.2), we conclude that (8.9) and (8.10) continue to hold in this case. We complete the proof by an application of Theorem 2.4(i). ■

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Christina Goldschmidt and Remco van der Hofstad for many helpful discussions, and Balázs Ráth for useful comments on a preliminary version of the paper. SB has been partially supported by NSF-DMS grants 1105581, 1310002, 160683, 161307 and SES grant 1357622. SS has been supported in part by EPSRC grant EP/J019496/1, a CRM-ISM fellowship, and the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) through the Gravitation Networks grant 024.002.003.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Abraham, J.-F. Delmas, and P. Hoscheit, *A note on the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance between (locally) compact metric measure spaces*, Electron. J. Probab. **18** (2013), no. 14, 1–21.

[2] L. Addario-Berry, *Tail bounds for the height and width of a random tree with a given degree sequence*, Random Structures Algorithms **41** (2012), no. 2, 253–261. MR2956056

[3] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt, *The continuum limit of critical random graphs*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **152** (2012), no. 3-4, 367–406. MR2892951

[4] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, C. Goldschmidt, and G. Miermont, *The scaling limit of the minimum spanning tree of the complete graph*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.1664 (2013).

[5] D. Aldous, *The continuum random tree. I*, Ann. Probab. **19** ((1991)), 1–28.

[6] D. Aldous, *Brownian excursions, critical random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent*, Ann. Probab. **25** (1997), no. 2, 812–854. MR1434128 (98d:60019)

[7] D. Aldous and J. Pitman, *A family of random trees with random edge lengths*, Random Structures Algorithms **15** (1999), no. 2, 176–195. MR1704343 (2000k:05242)

[8] D. Aldous and J. Pitman, *Inhomogeneous continuum random trees and the entrance boundary of the additive coalescent*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **118** (2000), no. 4, 455–482. MR1808372 (2002a:60012)

[9] S. Athreya, W. Löhr, and A. Winter, *The gap between Gromov-vague and Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.6309 (2014).
[10] E. A Bender and E R. Canfield, *The asymptotic number of labeled graphs with given degree sequences*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **24** (1978), no. 3, 296–307.
[11] E. A Bender, E R. Canfield, and B. D McKay, *The asymptotic number of labeled connected graphs with a given number of vertices and edges*, Random Structures & Algorithms **1** (1990), no. 2, 127–169.
[12] S. Bhamidi, N. Broutin, S. Sen, and X. Wang, *Scaling limits of random graph models at criticality: Universality and the basin of attraction of the Erdős-Rényi random graph*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.3417 (2014).
[13] S. Bhamidi, R. v. d. Hofstad, and S. Sen, *The multiplicative coalescent, inhomogeneous continuum random trees, and new universality classes for critical random graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.04645 (2015).
[14] S. Bhamidi, S. Sen, and X. Wang, *Continuum limit of critical inhomogeneous random graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.4118, To appear in Probab. Theory Related Fields (2014+).
[15] B. Bollobás, *The evolution of random graphs*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **286** (1984), no. 1, 257–274.
[16] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 73, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001. MR1864966 (2002j:05132)
[17] T. Britton, S. Janson, A. Martin-Löf, et al., *Graphs with specified degree distributions, simple epidemics, and local vaccination strategies*, Advances in Applied Probability **39** (2007), no. 4, 922–948.
[18] N. Broutin and J.-F. Marckert, *Asymptotics of trees with a prescribed degree sequence and applications*, Random Structures Algorithms **44** (2014), no. 3, 290–316. MR3188597
[19] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. MR1835418 (2002e:53053)
[20] J. Černý and A. Teixeira, *Critical window for the vacant set left by random walk on random regular graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms **43** (2013), no. 3, 313–337. MR3094422
[21] J. Černỳ, A. Teixeira, and D. Windisch, *Giant vacant component left by a random walk in a random d-regular graph*, Annales de l'institut henri poincaré (b), 2011, pp. 929–968.
[22] J. Černỳ and A. Q. Teixeira, *From random walk trajectories to random interlacements*, Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, 2012.
[23] C. Cooper and A. Frieze, *Component structure of the vacant set induced by a random walk on a random graph*, Random Structures Algorithms **42** (2013), no. 2, 135–158. MR3019395
[24] S. Dhara, R. v. d. Hofstad, J. v. Leeuwaarden, and S. Sen, *Critical configuration models with infinite third-moment degrees*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.00650 (2016).
[25] S. Dhara, R. v. d. Hofstad, J. v. Leeuwaarden, and S. Sen, *Critical window for the configuration model: finite third moment degrees*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.02868 (2016).
[26] A. Drewitz, B. Ráth, and A. Sapozhnikov, *An introduction to random interlacements*, Springer Briefs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2014. MR3308116
[27] S. N. Evans, *Probability and real trees*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1920, Springer, Berlin, 2008. Lectures from the 35th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2005. MR2351587 (2009d:60014)
[28] S. Fortunato, *Community detection in graphs*, Physics reports **486** (2010), no. 3, 75–174.
[29] A. Greven, P. Pfaffelhuber, and A. Winter, *Convergence in distribution of random metric measure spaces (Λ-coalescent measure trees)*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **145** (2009), no. 1-2, 285–322. MR2520129 (2011c:60008)
[30] M. Heydenreich and R. v. d. Hofstad, *Random graph asymptotics on high-dimensional tori*, Comm. Math. Phys. **270** (2007), no. 2, 335–358. MR2276449
[31] M. Heydenreich and R. v. d. Hofstad, *Random graph asymptotics on high-dimensional tori II: volume, diameter and mixing time*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **149** (2011), no. 3-4, 397–415. MR2776620
[32] R. v. d. Hofstad, *Random graphs and complex networks. Vol. I*, (2016). Available at `http://www.win.tue.nl/~rhofstad/NotesRGCN.html`.
[33] R. v. d. Hofstad and A. Nachmias, *Hypercube percolation*, Preprint (2012). To appear in *Journ. Europ. Math. Soc.*
[34] R. v. d. Hofstad and A. Sapozhnikov, *Cycle structure of percolation on high-dimensional tori*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **50** (2014), no. 3, 999–1027. MR3224297

[35] S. Janson, *Brownian excursion area, Wright's constants in graph enumeration, and other Brownian areas*, Probab. Surv. **4** (2007), 80–145. MR2318402
[36] S. Janson, *The probability that a random multigraph is simple*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **18** (2009), no. 1-2, 205–225.
[37] S. Janson, D. E Knuth, T. Łuczak, and B. Pittel, *The birth of the giant component*, Random Structures & Algorithms **4** (1993), no. 3, 233–358.
[38] A. Joseph et al., *The component sizes of a critical random graph with given degree sequence*, The Annals of Applied Probability **24** (2014), no. 6, 2560–2594.
[39] M. J Keeling and K. T. Eames, *Networks and epidemic models*, Journal of the Royal Society Interface **2** (2005), no. 4, 295–307.
[40] J.-F. Le Gall, *Random trees and applications*, Probab. Surv. **2** (2005), 245–311. MR2203728 (2007h:60078)
[41] T. Łuczak, *Component behavior near the critical point of the random graph process*, Random Structures & Algorithms **1** (1990), no. 3, 287–310.
[42] P. Massart, *The tight constant in the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality*, Ann. Probab. **18** (1990), no. 3, 1269–1283. MR1062069 (91i:60052)
[43] C. McDiarmid, *Concentration*, Probabilistic methods for algorithmic discrete mathematics, 1998, pp. 195–248.
[44] M. Molloy and B. Reed, *A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence*, Random structures & algorithms **6** (1995), no. 2-3, 161–180.
[45] A. Nachmias and Y. Peres, *Critical random graphs: diameter and mixing time*, The Annals of Probability (2008), 1267–1286.
[46] A. Nachmias and Y. Peres, *Critical percolation on random regular graphs*, Random Structures & ALgorithms **36** (2010), 111–148.
[47] M. E. Newman, *Spread of epidemic disease on networks*, Physical review E **66** (2002), no. 1, 016128.
[48] J. Pitman, *Combinatorial stochastic processes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1875, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Lectures from the 32nd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 7–24, 2002, With a foreword by Jean Picard. MR2245368
[49] O. Riordan, *The phase transition in the configuration model*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **21** (2012), no. 1-2, 265–299.
[50] J. Spencer, *Enumerating graphs and Brownian motion*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **50** (1997), no. 3, 291–294.
[51] A.-S. Sznitman, *Vacant set of random interlacements and percolation*, Annals of mathematics (2010), 2039–2087.
[52] A.-S. Sznitman, *A lower bound on the critical parameter of interlacement percolation in high dimension*, Probability theory and related fields **150** (2011), no. 3-4, 575–611.
[53] L. Takács, *A Bernoulli excursion and its various applications*, Advances in Applied Probability (1991), 557–585.
[54] E. M Wright, *The number of connected sparsely edged graphs*, Journal of Graph Theory **1** (1977), no. 4, 317–330.